

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the DEAN OF WINCHESTER, THE DEANERY, WINCHESTER, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXIII

DECEMBER, 1931

No. 138

EDITORIAL

EUCCHARISTIC UNITY

WE publish below as a "Document" the statement of Eucharistic belief which was issued to the Press early in October. Signed as it was by over 100 clergy of very different schools of thought, it attracted widespread attention; and we believe that our readers will be glad to have it for convenient reference in this, the twenty-third, volume of THEOLOGY. The degree of agreement which the statement represents is naturally not complete: but its net is thrown so wide that it does undoubtedly give an impressive demonstration of the common ground which underlies our much-advertised diversities. Warm thanks are due to the Master of the Temple, Canon Knight, and their collaborators, who refused to be daunted by the many difficulties in their path.

That the statement should have been criticized from both Catholic and Protestant quarters was perhaps only to have been expected; though we cannot understand the objection urged by certain lay members of the Church Assembly that signatures were obtained only from clergy. They must surely be aware that a similar volume of representative lay support would have been forthcoming if it had been solicited. Among the most pertinent criticisms which we have observed are those of the Secretary of the E.C.U. in the *Church Union Gazette* for November; and, since they are those of a well-informed writer, they deserve consideration. They are three in number. Clause 3 is objected to, on the ground that it studiously avoids "in any sort of way indicating the exact moment in the Liturgy at which the consecration of the Elements really does take place." But surely Mr. Pinchard would not maintain that this is a *sine qua non* of Eucharistic belief? For our own part, we believe that any such "moment" is purely liturgical and practical, not real and theological. Eastern and Western views differ definitely on the subject; and even within our own Communion itself, where both Eastern and Western liturgies are in use, different views are held. A statement of the kind before us can surely not be expected to settle a point which is by common consent left open, and which many of us consider need never be settled at all.

Yet another criticism is brought against the assertion in Clause 8 that "our Lord's Sacrifice, which reached its climax at Calvary, was completed by His Resurrection and Ascension." It is urged that our Lord's Sacrifice is completed only by the reception of the Sacrament. From one point of view—that of the individual worshipper at the Liturgy—true enough; but from the point of view of Eucharistic doctrine, No. As Père de la Taille, and others of our own Communion, have pointed out, the Resurrection and Ascension represent the *acceptance* of the Lord's Sacrifice, in the same way as the ascending smoke did in the case of the Levitical sacrifices; and that acceptance is properly spoken of as its "completion." Whether or not this was precisely what the authors of the statement had in mind, we do not know; but it is clearly concordant with the words of the document itself.

The Secretary of the E.C.U. further objects to Clause 4 as being couched in language that is "deliberately ambiguous." That is a criticism which has been echoed in other quarters also. The phrase seems to us unfortunate, owing to the qualifying adverb: for it implies that the ambiguity had a "political" rather than a theological aim. Had the framers of this document simply aimed at discovering *formulae* which would secure the adhesion of men of different standpoints, we should not have had half so impressive a statement as the one before us. On the contrary, they seem to us to have aimed at—or rather, not to have shrunk from—quite a different kind of ambiguity—namely, *the ambiguity of the Truth itself*. There they seem to us to have been wholly in the spirit and tradition of Anglican, and the best Catholic, theology. In that tradition, the silences of Revelation are no less significant, no less sacred, than its utterances: they too are holy ground, on which the foot of the enquirer may walk only with great caution; for God has willed to be hidden as well as revealed, and we must not force His hand. One inevitable result is what we call "ambiguity"; and it can be cleared up, not by the light of logic, but only by the light of love.

The article which we publish below from the pen of Lord Hugh Cecil affords ample illustration of these characteristic features of Anglican theology. There are some who will feel that the principle of reticence may be pressed too far; and that adoration outside the Liturgy and within it cannot really be separated. But on the principle itself we find ourselves in close agreement with Lord Hugh. We are more likely to err by defining and deducing too much than too little; and the concluding simile of the woman who touched the hem of Christ's garment seems to us to contain a lesson of the deepest value, and one that can scarcely be too carefully pondered.

CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST ACCORDING TO THE PRAYER BOOK AND ARTICLES

It occurred to me that there might be room in the pages of THEOLOGY for a comparatively unlearned statement about the doctrine of the Church of England, as expressed in the Articles and Prayer Book, relating to the divine presence in the Eucharist. I write therefore merely as a layman, who reads his Book of Common Prayer and Thirty-Nine Articles, without the background of deep and wide theological studies.

I find, first of all, that it seems clear that the Articles teach that the consecrated bread and wine become by consecration the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. This is, I observe, sometimes denied by those of the Evangelical school, who maintain that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is to be found in the whole rite of His holy ordinance and not in the consecrated elements themselves. But this is an opinion which is irreconcilable with the language of the Articles. Article XXIX. is on this point quite unequivocal: "The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," etc. Clearly neither the wicked nor the faithful "press with their teeth" the whole rite or service but only the consecrated elements. The Article teaches beyond doubt that the consecrated bread and wine are the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. This is confirmed in the concluding words, where it is said that the wicked "to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing." Article XXX. has the same teaching. It is said that the cup is not to be refused, "for both the parts of the Lord's sacrament . . . ought to be ministered," etc. Clearly the sacrament is thought of as a thing of two parts, the bread and the wine. Article XXVIII. teaches likewise, for it says: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." Evidently it is the bread and wine which alone can be reserved, carried about, etc.; one could not carry about the whole rite or service. Nor does the rest of the language of the Article teach differently. We read that "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten . . . only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." This, of course, conforms perfectly to the belief that the bread and wine are the outward and physical part of a sacrament, of which the inward part is spiritual. The rejection of transubstantiation is so phrased as to suggest the same way of thinking. For the

condemnation is directed against a physical change, as is shown by the words "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament." These words make the objection to the transformation of the physical outward part of the sacrament that it leaves no sacrament, since a sacrament essentially unites in one mystical whole the physical and spiritual.

The teaching of the Prayer Book is the same. The clearest expression is in the rubric of the Communion of the Sick, where we read in the instruction for spiritual communion, "earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving Him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ profitably to his Soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth." The sacrament is plainly the bread and wine: no one could receive the whole rite or service with his mouth. The language of the warning ordered to be read when notice is given of the celebration of the Holy Communion accords with the teaching of the Articles, that the bread and wine are the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. The priest gives notice "to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." What is administered is obviously the bread and wine, not the whole service. The longer Exhortation gives the same general impression, especially when it is said "If with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us)," and goes on to deal with the corporeal judgments which according to St. Paul await impenitent and unfaithful reception. The prayer of humble access suggests the reality of the bodily relation between our bodies and the body of Christ, and this implies dependence on the belief that the bread which is eaten is the sacrament of Christ's body. The words of administration, naturally interpreted, teach the same lesson; and so very emphatically does the rule that if the consecrated bread or wine be exhausted there must be a second consecration to supply what is needed. If the service were the essence of the sacrament, the circumstance that some of the bread or wine had not been consecrated would have no significance. The requirement that all the bread and wine which is sacramentally received should be expressly consecrated shows that the consecrated bread and wine are the sacrament of the body and blood, and that the mystical relation with Christ is through and by the consecrated elements. Nor is there any other sufficient explanation for the reverence with which the consecrated elements are required

to be treated; nor for the rule that they must be reverently eaten and drunk, if any be left over after the service. The prayer of thanksgiving after communion, in which it is said "Thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood," is to the same effect, for what communicants have received is the bread and wine, which are here described as "holy mysteries." All this language confirms the teaching of Article XXIX. that what communicants carnally press with their teeth is the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. And this mystery is expressly expounded in the Catechism. Here we are taught that a sacrament consists of an outward visible sign and an inward spiritual grace, and that the outward sign of the Lord's Supper is the bread and wine, while the inward part or thing signified is the body and blood of Christ. Reading this with the Articles, we learn that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ which is carnally pressed with our teeth has two parts—an outward part, the bread, and an inward part, the body of Christ. So that while we press with our teeth the outward part of the sacrament, we take and receive the inward part which inheres in the same sacrament. The sacrament is thought of as a whole, comprising two parts, the outward part of which we physically eat and the inward part we spiritually receive. But both parts are parts of one sacrament—a mystical whole, to which both the spiritual and the physical belong.

To complete the survey of the Prayer Book it is necessary to say something about the Declaration about Kneeling. The important words are: "It is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." The history of the Declaration and of these words in particular is highly significant. The Declaration was inserted in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. by the order of the Council, against the advice of Archbishop Cranmer, and without submitting it to Convocation. As it was then drafted the words "real and essential presence" occurred where "corporal presence" is now found. In that form the Declaration certainly went a long way towards condemning belief that the inward part of

the sacrament is the body and blood of Christ. But in 1559 the Declaration was omitted, in conformity with the general complexion of the changes made in the Prayer Book under Elizabeth. It was not reinserted in the Prayer Book until 1662, when the very important change from "real and essential presence" to "corporal presence" was made. Difficulties may still be found in the Declaration in respect to treating heaven as a place and in affirming that Christ's natural body is in heaven, which certainly does not appear to be what Scripture teaches. For, according to St. Paul, the natural body at the Resurrection was transformed into a spiritual body, and so the narratives of the Third and Fourth Gospels plainly indicate. But this is a criticism which has nothing to do with the sacrament; and to say that there is in the sacrament no corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood is only to say over again that "transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a sacrament." It is to deny that there is any change in the physical outward sign, but does not at all deny the inward and spiritual gift. I am afraid it must be frankly admitted that here, as on some other occasions, the bishops of the English Church, from the most charitable motives, were guilty of something which approaches an artifice. For to deny the corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood would be possible to an instructed Roman Catholic theologian and certainly is a denial which any Anglican could make. It seems impossible to doubt that the bishops in 1662 revived the amended Declaration in order to soothe the feelings of the Puritan clergy and make it easy for them to accept the Prayer Book, well knowing that the Declaration in its new form did not really determine anything that was in controversy within the English Church. The artifice was to say something which was little more than a platitude, with an emphasis which might make ill-instructed people suppose that it had much more than the importance attaching to a platitude. In changing "real and essential presence" to "corporal presence" the bishops took away from the Declaration what made it valuable to an intelligent Puritan, though it might still soothe an unintelligent one.

It seems that it may fairly be claimed that the Articles and Prayer Book do (more than is often believed) teach a definite and coherent doctrine about the relation of Christ to the consecrated elements. They teach that the bread and wine become by consecration the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, and that that sacrament is thereafter a holy mystery, made up of two parts, an outward and physical part, which is taken in the mouth and pressed with the teeth of the communicant, and an inward and spiritual part, which is the body and blood of

Christ, verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful. This is what it is common to call the doctrine of the real spiritual presence of Christ in the sacrament; and there does not seem to me to be any doubt at all that the Articles and Prayer Book teach that the relation of Christ to the communicant is in and through the consecrated elements, and that therefore, if you use the word "presence" at all, it should be in respect to the elements that it is used.

It is possible that this might not be disputed but for a further opinion which holds to belief in what theologians call "concomitance." This means that where the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is, there is also the whole person of Christ. About this opinion the Articles and Prayer Book say very little. They do indeed clearly teach that to the faithful communicants Christ is in the fullest sense concomitant with the consecrated elements—that is, that faithful communicants do fully partake of Christ in all the power of His divine person. But Article XXIX. denies that the unfaithful communicant partakes of Christ. It is notable that it does not deny, though it is sometimes supposed so to do, that the unfaithful communicant partakes of the body of Christ. How sin hinders the unfaithful communicant, who receives the consecrated bread and wine, from partaking of Christ is not determined by the Article. It is said that the communicant "presses with his teeth" the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, but that he does not partake of Christ; and the matter is not carried any further, nor is any attempt made to reconcile these two propositions by an explanation. But apart from communion itself, I can find nothing in the Prayer Book and Articles relating either by affirmation or denial to the concomitance of Christ with the sacrament of His body and blood. The very guarded phrase that the sacrament "was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped" appears to censure the practices referred to as presumptuous, but does not make the conclusive objection against those practices, that Christ's person is in no sense related to the sacrament so reserved or carried about. Concomitance is neither affirmed nor denied; but another and much safer objection is taken, that the censured practices go beyond the ordinance of Christ.

It would not be necessary to discuss the question of the relation of Christ to the sacrament of His body—a question about which both humility and reverence would desire to be silent—if the use of what are called "Devotions" to the sacrament had not been adopted in some of the English churches. It does not seem to me to be possible candidly to deny either that the language of the Article does impute presumption to

those who reserve, carry about and worship the sacrament of Christ's body, or that the objection taken by the Article is a well-founded one. Reservation for the communion of the sick is not obnoxious to the Article's criticism and cannot, I think, have been in the mind of the writer of the Article; for reservation for communion cannot be said to go beyond Christ's ordinance, since He clearly intended that those who could receive communion should receive it. It is reservation in order to make the sacrament a centre of adoration that is outside the divine ordinance; and it raises at once the question of the concomitance of Christ's person apart from communion—a question which it seems that a humble and devout mind may feel diffident to answer. What do we mean by a sacramental body? Indeed, what do we mean by body, even in respect to our own natural bodies? What is the relation between a person and his body? One cannot, I think, say with exactness that a person is locally present in his body; for if he is locally present he must be present in some particular part of the body, and which part is that? The truth is that the relation between a person and his body, though it is a relation so familiar that we think we understand it, is really transcendent and mystical, known certainly to exist and known in respect to many of its consequences, but not known in itself, so that we can explain what the relation is or what is the nature of its beginning at birth or its end in death. It may be perhaps safe to say that a person's body is his expression and instrument in matter. But how personality expresses itself in matter or uses matter as its instrument cannot be explained. And it is only as a part of physical experience that we can say what personality can make its body do. The effects of the relation are known in experience, but the nature of the relation itself is unknown.

If, then, we ask what is the relation between Christ and His sacramental body, the least rash answer seems to be that it must be like the relation between a person and his natural body. This does not help us in respect to the relation itself, for it is only to explain one unknown thing by another. But we do know the effects of the relation between a person and his natural body; and we know especially that they are conditioned by the matter of which the body is composed. Applying the analogy to the sacrament it seems reasonable to say that it is the will of Christ only to do for us through the sacrament what can be done by bread and wine. Bread and wine can be eaten and drunk; so, when they have become the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, we can eat and drink that sacrament and so partake of Christ. But if we use the sacrament of Christ's body as a centre of devotion, we are using bread in an inap-

appropriate and unmeaning way. The sacramental body of Christ differs in this from a natural body, that it has no senses by which to hear or see and no organs by which to act. If we are to think of the sacramental body as conditioned, like the natural body, by the limitations imposed by its material form, there seems little sense, and therefore little true reverence, in Devotions to the sacrament. If we kneel before a human king and petition him for mercy, he sees us with his eyes, he hears our words with his ears, and he can, if he chooses, answer us with his voice; for a natural body has powers of seeing and hearing and speaking. But if we kneel before the sacrament of the body of Christ, Christ cannot see us through His sacramental body nor hear us nor speak to us, for Christ's sacramental body has neither senses nor organs. Doubtless, indeed, our prayers are heard, but they are heard by the omnipresence of deity and not in virtue of the mystical relation between Christ and His sacramental body. This criticism, of course, applies only to devotion to the sacrament and not in the least to treating it with the utmost reverence, as being, what in truth and reality it is, the sacramental body of Christ. The utmost reverence when it is moved or reserved, the use of gesture and of marks of honour like lights are, if they are sincerely and naturally expressive of our faith and reverence, perfectly proper. But prayer to Christ in the sacrament has, I suggest, no intelligible meaning; and Article XXVIII. is in the right when it recalls us to the wisdom and reverence of not going beyond the ordinance of Christ.

It does not quite follow that we must deny what those who value Devotions to the sacrament strongly affirm, that their prayer and adoration are met and rewarded by a sense of the presence and love and mercy of Christ. For one thing, human beings are naturally and innocently susceptible of associations attached to places and things. The near neighbourhood of anything so sacred as the sacramental body of Christ may reasonably be thought to create a certain atmosphere, which makes devotion easy and moving. But the worshipper ought to recognize that the reserved sacrament only gives to him, it may be with special strength and poignancy, the same sort of influence as the sacred edifice in which it is reserved, with its long tradition of prayer and praise, or as the posture of kneeling, which he himself assumes and which suggests to him the adoration he desires to express. Still it may be said that the Gospel teaches us that Christ does accept and reward simple faith, even if it expresses itself unintelligently and unreasonably. Nothing could be more indefensible at the bar of reasonable criticism than the belief of the poor woman who

thought she might be healed by touching the hem of Christ's garment. Beforehand we should have felt justified in telling her that to suppose that His life was really in His garment, or that His spiritual power could be ministered to her through the garment, was an absurdity. But in fact her faith turned the garment, for that one occasion and for that one touch, into a true sacrament; and the divine presence went forth to heal her. Accordingly we are perhaps most nearly approaching the mind and will of Christ, if we refrain from blaming those who in sincere simplicity think themselves edified by Devotions to the sacrament. And as long as they are satisfied with private prayers offered before the aumbry where the sacrament is reserved, we shall do well to abstain from criticism and to give thanks for their piety. But it is quite a different thing to ask that the Church through its bishops should sanction public and common Devotions, which cannot, I think, be reasonably defended, and are the subject of an unanswerable criticism in Article XXVIII. Christ rewarded the faith of the simple woman who touched the hem of His garment; but He never made that miracle the basis of any permanent institution for His Church. The toleration of the natural expressions of personal piety by individuals accords with His example and teaching; but an unsanctioned and unreasonable addition to His ordinance is better avoided.

HUGH CECIL.

MINISTERIAL TRAINING*

My choice of subject requires some explanation and, perhaps also, an apology to Boddington, who gave a paper on the same theme rather more than a year ago. To him I would say that in my recollection his most interesting paper was concerned mainly with the training of non-graduate candidates coming forward a little later than the normal age; I want to deal more widely with the whole problem. And for the rest, since some of the brethren have been engaged in work of this kind as examining chaplains for many years, I want to throw out some points for discussion in which their experience will be invaluable. I do not expect general agreement with what I have to say, nor do I claim any kind of infallibility, but the problem of training for the Ministry is so urgent, and to some extent is being dealt with so unsatisfactorily, that perhaps some good may accrue from a sharing of thoughts and plannings which have seriously occupied my mind for some years past. I have used

* A paper read before the Concord Club, April 27, 1931.

the title "Ministerial Training" because I want to deal with something wider than training for the Ministry, and so I have five headings: The Finding, The Testing, The pre-Ordination Training, The post-Ordination Training, and the Parish.

For some years past serious efforts have been made to increase the number of the clergy and to provide means for the training of those who express a wish to be ordained. Unfortunately, this work has been undertaken for the most part by groups within the Church; I say unfortunately, not because I wish to minimize the value of the work done by these groups, or to discourage them from further effort, but because it seems to me that there has been enough time since the War for the whole Church to have evolved a scheme for the financing and training of the normal candidate, and in fact very little has been done. The Sponsors' scheme is admittedly a temporary measure, and depends upon the private generosity of the few; the National Assembly puts down in its budget each year, I believe, a sum of £20,000 for this purpose, but, so far as I know, the Central Advisory Council for the Training of the Ministry does not receive this money for distribution, either to the various theological Colleges or by way of bursaries to individual candidates. The question is admittedly difficult of solution, but it ought not to be beyond the wit of man to devise some plan whereby money shall be available out of central funds for the training of clergy; and I believe that it is not difficult to arouse the enthusiasm of Church-people in this cause. But I hope to say more on this point later on in this paper.

I

How are ordination candidates to be found? We are told that there are plenty of boys and young men who are anxious to be ordained but are held back for various reasons, of which the chief is the cost of training. I am not sure that all of those who are most vocal in their sense of vocation are likely to make the best parsons, or that money, which seems to be fairly easily forthcoming for the devout server of the London suburban church, is being put to the best advantage on every occasion. There is an uncomfortable feeling in my mind from time to time that we do not get hold of the best material, just because it is the business of the second best to be clamant, and to be heard for its much speaking; whereas often the best is shy and reserved, and so is overlooked.

It is primarily the duty of parents to discover whether their boys appear to have a call to this service. Nothing can be

more disastrous than the picture in *Father Ralph** of the boy who had been dedicated from birth by his parents to the Roman priesthood; but there is all the difference in the world between that method of finding clergy, and the prayerful watching of a father over his boy, and the holding out of the priesthood as a possible vocation among other walks of life in which his son may be called to glorify God. If, as is sometimes cynically said, the Church of England gets the priests she deserves, the fault lies at the door of those Church parents who never put to their sons the duty of considering the priesthood, as they would the law, or medicine, or the services, when thinking of what they are to do in life. If parents fail to do this, it is said that headmasters should do it instead. Possibly they should, but it is only natural that they will refrain from suggesting a walk of life to their elder boys if they have reason to believe that parents will disapprove or discourage. In the same way, though the clergy may do much indirectly, it is often impossible, even if it were always desirable, to make a direct suggestion to this effect to a lad or young man. Ultimately it is the parents who must decide, for it is upon them that the burden of training expenses is likely to fall, in some measure at all events, and they must have the last word. Thus the priest who is anxious that possible vocations among his boys shall not be lost will keep in as close touch with the parents as is possible, and by general interest in their sons' education and plans may be able to find out whether the question of the Ministry should be raised. At the same time it is necessary to remember that not every good, churchgoing lad is called to the priesthood, or would make a good parson. The need for a strong body of devout laymen is, to my mind, more urgent than for an increase in the sacred Ministry; and to suppose that, because a young man shows outwardly more signs of a devout life than some of his companions he is therefore called to be ordained, is to lower the whole standard of devotional habit for the rest.

Parents and clergy and schoolmasters, so far as they are able, and all who are concerned with the training of boys in any way, may do much in the initial stages in helping a boy to think clearly about his future work for God in the world and so he may come to hear a distinct call from God. If he becomes convinced that the Ministry is to be his life's work, there is little doubt in my own mind but that sooner or later he will be able to answer the call of the Holy Spirit. Thus I am not desirous that priests should, so to speak, "dig for vocations" as for hidden treasure, and measure the success of their work

* *Father Ralph*, by Gerald O'Donovan. Macmillan. 1913.

with young men by the number of Ordination candidates whom they have sent up to the Diocesan Board, or to a definite course of training. To be alert for signs of vocation, to be ready to assist with advice when the right time comes by being in touch with parents, and the boys themselves so as to hold the confidence of both, seems to me to be the chief way in which the parish priest is to find out whether his boys are called to this Service or not. In any case it is dangerous, and often very wrong, that any direct suggestion should be made to a lad. With due but indirect encouragement let the suggestion come first from the boy or his parents.

II

But when the priest is faced with a boy or young man of whom it is said that he desires to be ordained, how is the reality of that vocation and his own sincerity to be tested? Naturally such testing must vary with the age, surroundings and background of the candidate. The public school boy or the undergraduate probably approaches the question from an angle utterly different from that of the young clerk or artisan; but all alike are seeking admission to a common service with common ideals, and so to all alike certain tests may be applied. Among such universal tests I think we may include the following:

(a) Steadfastness of purpose should be fairly easily recognizable, having regard to differing circumstances of life. Personally, I look for this steadfastness in rather less marked degree, in outward appearance, in the school-boy or undergraduate than in one who has come to this sense out of some kind of employment; and I do so because with the school-boy it is all still very remote, and he cannot weigh the seriousness of it all, or understand what it will involve of personal discipline and sacrifice. The undergraduate enters upon a life of extraordinary interest and fascination, a life which, like a diamond, has a million flashing facets; he is concerned with new points of view upon life from whatever angle he approaches it. So it is quite often the case, and justifiably so, that the overwhelming sense of vocation which a sixth form boy not infrequently experiences fades somewhat into the background in view of all the new interests rushing upon him. For all such we should be well content if they maintain their religious life, so far as it can be observed, and bear their witness of a healthy tone in all College activities, without, perhaps, much evidence of a growing and deepening spiritual apprehension. That will come, and come all the more richly in their theological college, if they

have been faithful to the light as they see it during school and university days.

(b) A second test should be the gift of leadership in some form or other. Not all are called to be great generals, or even scoutmasters; but the priest who is unable to lead his people does not inspire confidence in his parish. It need not be a leadership of the strong, bustling type, a rather domineering mastery which easily develops into bullying, nor that of marked efficiency which is often summed up in the estimate that "So-and-So makes a good chairman." But we have a right to look for a personality in our Ordination candidates which not only draws forth the respect of their fellows but makes them trusted in their own circle, men of a certain prestige.

(c) Again, there must be intellectual promise. That a man can just scrape through a Matriculation and the G.O.E. should not be tolerated as a satisfactory standard, in general, for our younger candidates. Intellect is not everything, but it does not seem to me to be presumptuous to take failure in examinations to be a way in which God sometimes shows that the priesthood is not the life in which a particular person is best able to serve Him. The standard expected must vary with age and educational background, and must be balanced with other gifts and qualities; but it is pathetic that so much money is spent on getting men through examinations which they can only pass by cramming, which is no education at all, and then, having dragged them up to a supposed standard, to send them out ill-equipped for a service which is continually making fresh demands upon their all too slender intellectual resources. I shall have something more to say under this head later in this paper, and will therefore leave this point here; but I wish to make it clear that I believe intellectual promise to be a most vital test of suitability for the ministry.

(d) Further, there should be evidence of submissiveness to the will of God, and a readiness to follow such directions as shall be given by those who are in charge of a man's training. The persistency with which a man seeks Ordination is sometimes regarded as a sign of his sincerity and perseverance. Such it undoubtedly is from time to time. But I am afraid it is true that if a man goes on long enough he will probably find a bishop, sooner or later, who will ordain him, almost out of hand; and it is to be feared that self-will rather than self-sacrifice is the motive which urges a man to go on when those who are best qualified to advise have told him that he ought to seek to serve God as a layman rather than a priest.

(e) There is one test more which I think should be applied, though it is not of the same universal cogency as those which

I have mentioned. It is the question of a man's relationship towards the other sex. With the public school boy and university man the problem arises less frequently, since marriage in that class of society is nearly always later than in other grades. Thus the candidate's brothers and friends are not all "going out with a girl," as the phrase goes, and there is no reason why *he* should. It is far otherwise with many of those who are now coming forward for ordination; nearly all such a man's friends begin "courting" at about the age of twenty-one or so, and marry early. It should be made clear to the aspirant to the priesthood that on no account may he consider himself free to enter into an engagement to marry, or have any thought of the kind during his time of training. Personally, I should like it to be an understood thing that no priest should think of marriage at all until he has reached thirty years of age. If, as I believe is the case, the Cowley Fathers will not allow a man to take life vows for the monastic state till he is thirty, there is at least no less strength in the argument that a man who is giving his life to God in the secular priesthood has no right to consider the possibility of marriage till he is of the same age as the novice in Religion. Unhappily it is too often the case, as I know by experience, that while a man is preparing for the moment when he must make the surrender of his whole life to God in the priestly office, he is simultaneously looking forward to life vows in matrimony. There are exceptions to every rule, but the exceptions in this case are so few in genuine urgency, that I should have no hesitation in refusing to go on with the training of a man, if I found that he had become engaged to be married during the time of his preparation.

III

Now to pass to my third heading, the pre-ordination training. I still believe that a University course followed by a theological college for as long a time as is possible—I would suggest two years—is the best of all; and I should always urge a man not to read theology as his degree course. Indeed, I would say, "Anything in the world rather than theology, till you have graduated." If a man is able to stay up for a post-graduate course, then naturally he will read either the theology school or the diploma in theology which some Universities give. But it is surely a mistake to begin theological study, which will probably be the staple of a man's subsequent reading throughout his life, till as broad and adequate a foundation of general culture has been laid. There is a further objection in my mind

to the reading of theology as a degree course; or perhaps it is better to say, a reason for postponing it till a man is at his theological college. Theology should be read in a devotional atmosphere, where a man can link up his new knowledge of criticism or of dogma with his prayer life. Such an atmosphere is far more easily secured in a theological college away from the University, so that a sense of the real values and ultimate realities can be gained. It is often said that a man goes to his theological college to learn to say his prayers; this is not meant to imply that he has never yet said his prayers or been learning anything of the inner life. But it is not seriously open to question that few men have ever undertaken the spiritual exercises which form part of the normal life of places such as Cuddesdon or Ely till they get there. They are more likely to build up a reasonable faith, and to avoid that flippancy which is painfully apparent in some students of theology, in Oxford at all events, if they read as they pray, and pray as they read.

I should like to say something about a proposal that theological colleges should be established in close connection with our older Universities, where men can attend lectures in the Faculty; but I must pass over this point for lack of time; perhaps it may be referred to in the discussion which will follow, for I want now to say something about the training of non-graduates. Nothing I shall say is meant to apply to older men, *i.e.* those who are over, at all events, twenty-five years of age; the bishop alone should decide what kind of training should be undertaken, and what standard should be aimed at, and he will lay down his own conditions, having regard to the man's background and general conditions of life. But there is no need for exceptions with younger men; they should be able to undertake the same general plan of study and training, and to reach a standard which can receive universal acknowledgment and respect. What should this plan be?

All should reach a good Matriculation standard before they approach the diocese for acceptance or financial support. The development of test schools, such as at Knutsford, or the Mirfield School at Tatterford, could be encouraged with great advantage for men who are able, in one way or another, to afford it; but I am quite clear that diocesan funds ought not to be used for this purpose, and that there should be no idea that a man at such a test school is, as yet, an ordination candidate. If these test schools can be developed, the non-graduate colleges will be relieved of the very hampering necessity laid upon them at present of providing a Matriculation course as well as one for theology. Most of them are understaffed for the work they

have to do, which requires so much individual tutoring; and the presence of men, who in fact are probationers, with those who have been duly accepted for theological training, brings problems of administration and general policy for a college as a whole very keenly to the foreground. But these test schools cannot meet every need. Many men are not in a position to give up their daily work to undertake such a course, more especially when they realize that they may be sent back into the world again, as being in some way or other unsuitable for ordination. For these the establishment of Matriculation night school classes in association with the local education authority is undoubtedly the best plan. I do not agree that it is the business of the clergy to run such classes; it is good for the men themselves to be doing their Matriculation course along with many others who have quite different aims in life; and it is good for a town that its Education Authority should be sharing in the first stages of ministerial training no less than in the training required for commerce. Admittedly work at a night school, after a day spent in the mill or the office, demands a good deal of self-sacrifice and perseverance, but many young men undertake it for less altruistic motives than those which should inspire an aspirant for the priesthood, and if a fellow is successful in obtaining his Matriculation in this way, it is evidence at once of a reasonable intellectual ability, and of those qualities of perseverance and sincerity without which no Diocesan Board can properly be asked to undertake financial liability on a man's behalf. Throughout this period it is the business of the parish priest to keep in close touch with the matriculand. The setting up of guilds for such men, admirable though they may be in themselves, is not altogether advisable; it tends to give its members a status which they come to regard as equivalent to being ordination candidates, which, as yet, they ought not to be, and it may cause friction with individual parish priests or the men themselves. The diocesan organization at this stage should be as loose as is compatible with efficiency for the immediate purpose, and the supervisory work, on its spiritual side, should be the duty of the man's own clergyman.

When a man has passed his Matriculation and has been accepted by the Diocesan Board, and the possibility of University training is excluded, he should be sent to a non-graduate theological college for not less than three years' residence. Private reading, which is sometimes accepted at this stage, is of little use; the discipline of common life and of the rules of the place is invaluable, and should be as strict as may be. A disciplined clergy is perhaps our greatest need, and unless a man has learnt the value of regular and fairly stern discipline before

ordination he is not very likely to do so in the hurly-burly and freedom of modern parish life, where, to a large extent, unfortunately, each one is a law to himself. The kind of curriculum to be provided for these men raises most difficult problems. No one pretends that the G.O.E. is satisfactory for any candidate, but it is clearly of more value to a graduate than to one who has less educational background. If a wider course of study could be devised for these men, it would be more beneficial for them, but since it is necessary to set some general standard for the Deacon's examination, it is perhaps inevitable that G.O.E. should be the test. It is not so much that I quarrel with the syllabus as with the impression that if a man has passed the G.O.E. he is properly trained for his life's work. If we can set up schools for our younger clergy, however, this difficulty will be in great measure overcome. Again, if the bishops are in earnest when they say that the ultimate intention is that all ordinands will be required to take a degree course at some University, except in quite abnormal circumstances, objections to the G.O.E. syllabus, save in details here and there, will hardly be necessary, since all those who take it will have a reasonable background of general education, and will have attained to much the same standard. But until the bishops carry out their intention, which is obviously impossible until there is a properly organized central scheme to meet the cost, we shall probably have to go on with the present arrangements, and this makes post-ordination training of very great importance.

IV

The ordinary parishioner supposes that when a man has been ordained priest at all events he is fully equipped for his work, and only needs experience in parochial work for a few years in order to "qualify," as he would put it, for a living. Such an opinion is most unfair to the young assistant curate; it puts him in a false position, and sometimes lays upon him burdens and responsibilities which he should never, at that stage, be asked to shoulder; and it relieves an unthinking incumbent from the necessity of any supervision after the diaconate is over. There is most urgent need for a regular system of post-ordination training undertaken by the diocese for the younger clergy as a whole, and by the incumbent for his particular junior priests.

I should like to see schools for the junior clergy set up in every diocese, and attendance at them made compulsory. In a diocese like our own there should be no difficulty about it. Means of communication are easy, the diocese is reasonably

compact, so that men could attend regular courses of lectures in some central place for three, four, or five years after ordination. In country dioceses it would not be so easy. Such lectures would, of necessity, be concentrated into "schools" of not more than five days' duration at the most, probably two or three times a year, whereas in a town diocese the work can be spread over a long period of, say, fortnightly meetings, and no question of hospitality, and very little of expense, need arise. They should be quite distinct from devotional gatherings or retreats, but should be clearly and definitely what they are intended to be, a means of furthering the intellectual efficiency of those who attend them. If a man left his first diocese before the period, four or five years, was up, he should be transferred to the school in his new diocese, and finish the work there. Courses should be given in the Bible, ascetic and moral theology, perhaps psychology; and there might be courses in more general subjects, ecclesiastical history, church architecture, music, and so on, as opportunity served and need arose. I remember being told at Cuddesdon that I should always have a book of the Bible on the "stocks" which I was studying in the original language with the best available commentary. I wish I had followed that advice; but if all the younger clergy went to school for five years after ordination they would cover much ground under competent guidance, and be less likely to give it up when their schooling days were over. In every diocese there is, almost certainly, a sufficient number of older clergy competent to undertake work of this kind; they might be formed into a College of Chaplains, and might be of the greatest assistance to the younger men in the direction of their lives, spiritually no less than intellectually. I believe that something of the sort is already being done in one or two dioceses; I can see no real reason why it could not be organized for the whole Church. But it is important that the same scheme should be followed everywhere, as far as may be, since men move about from one diocese to another, and overlapping only results in loss of efficiency.

But the incumbent has an important part to play, no less than the diocese, in the training of the junior clergy. It is generally only in the larger parishes that assistant priests are to be found, and so one of the qualifications for preferment to such a parish should be ability as a curate trainer. At the same time it is at least a questionable policy to send a deacon to a great parish where the work is always more than can be compassed by the staff available. The deacon, at any rate, should never be expected to "share the work" as the phrase goes, nor should he, in fairness to himself no less than in common honesty,

be spoken of as "my colleague," since such he cannot as yet be in any real sense. The bishop's licence to a parish practically always includes one for preaching, and that quite unrestrictedly. I wish bishops would forbid their deacons to preach more than once a month, or thereabouts, and that they would charge the incumbent that the deacon's sermon must always be submitted to him, written out *in extenso*, for approval and amendment. The amount of preaching and the giving of addresses at odd services which a deacon often does, even in well-guided parishes, is quite scandalous. To reduce it may mean that the amount of preaching done in the parish is considerably curtailed, but, generally speaking, that would be little loss. Most parishes are preached to far more than is good for them, and few of us would deny that, vital as it is, we have raised the ministry of the Word to such a place of importance that our people will hardly come to church at all unless there is going to be a sermon, though they often grumble at its quality. To be allowed to have a deacon should be an honour to the whole parish; it should feel that it is entrusted with a vital part of clerical training, and so, in return, should be ready to sacrifice some of the things to which it is accustomed. I believe that a deacon should be sent back to his theological college for a whole term immediately before his priest's ordination, and that the parish should bear the expenses thus incurred. Normally a deacon's stipend is less than that of a priest; but his parish, instead of reaping a financial advantage by getting cheap labour, should pay the difference to the theological college for the time that the man returns there in preparation for his priest's ordination. To the deacon such a time would be quite invaluable. It would give him that opportunity for quiet which is really essential, and which few ever get, and it would enable him to co-ordinate his experience already gained, and view his future life in the light of nine months or so in the parish. In any case the priest, even at the beginning of his priestly ministry, is in a position of far greater responsibility than during his diaconate, and he needs a quiet time of preparation to face the new unutterably solemn responsibilities.

In some sense it may be said that a deacon is a luxury; he should never be set to do all the ordinary work of the parochial clergyman except the celebration of the Holy Communion, as is too often seen. It is the priest's work, and not the deacon's, to baptize, except in emergency, and to marry, and to deal with the sick, as the Prayer Book clearly directs, and to bury the dead; and yet quite often these duties are shared by priests and deacons in a parish, without discrimination. In my first parish, as a deacon, I was allowed to do none of these things, and the restric-

tions went further still: I never read the first lesson in the Offices because, my vicar explained, I was given only the New Testament at my ordination, and so I must neither read nor preach from the Old Testament until I had had the whole Bible put into my hands with authority from the bishop to use it. This may seem, perhaps, rather straining after a gnat, but it has a real value, not only in helping to keep the deacon himself humble, but in making the parish realize the vital difference between the two orders, and so to treat the deacon with greater consideration, expecting less from him. It may be said that such restrictions as I suggest are unnecessary, and, at best, a counsel of perfection. In these days of dire shortage of clergy, it is inevitable that more work should be given to the deacon than would be right if times were better. But, frankly, I do not believe in arguments of that kind which are purely *ad hoc* and tend to confusion of thought on fundamental issues. We shall never increase the number of clergy by lowering, in any direction, the standard. The spectacle of men ill-equipped by their primary training, and unable to improve their qualifications because they are always being harried by a multitude of occupations, is not likely to attract others to the work. The clergy's greatest need, in towns at all events, is to lead less scrambled lives; it were better for the Church that she should curtail some of her activities for a time in order that her clergy might be better able to do such work as is really within their compass, than to cast the net so wide that it cannot be controlled. So the deacon should do his proper work only, not at the expense of the incumbent, who must therefore try to do the work of two men, but by a restriction, if need be, of work all round, in which the parish will gladly share because it has been privileged to help in ministerial training by being honoured by the bishop in sending to it a man at the very beginning of his ministry. The creation of such an outlook would, I believe, be of untold value to the Church; it would help the clergy to concentrate on the things of paramount importance, and help the laity to realize what those things are, and what share they must take in setting their parsons free to accomplish them. I have spoken of post-ordination study already, but it has a bearing here also. It is generally understood that a deacon will have time for reading because of his priest's examination; but it quite often seems to be supposed that that time for reading need not be secured to him when he has attained the priesthood. If an atmosphere such as I suggest could be created, we should hear less of the clergy's complaint that they have no time for reading; instead of falling into the delusion of being always busy from the moment of their ordination, they would have been learning,

from the start, to discriminate between differing kinds of "busy-ness," and so be better able to adjust their external activities to the vital necessity of study and quiet. Their own standard of efficiency, both spiritual and intellectual, would be raised thereby; they would profit, and their people would profit, and as the level of clerical attainment was raised, and the ideals of priestly life more clearly set forth and recognized, more recruits for the Ministry would be found.

V

I have already anticipated, to some extent, what I wanted to say under my last heading—namely, the Parish; but there are one or two suggestions of a more general kind that I would like to make. I never feel that enough use is made of the Ember seasons; and yet here, four times a year, there is a golden opportunity for bringing before our people the nature of the Ministry, the needs of the Church in this respect, and the needs of the clergy themselves, in ways other than meeting the calls of the Pensions Board or the Dilapidations Measure.

It is a great loss to the laity that, generally speaking, they never witness an ordination; there must be many layfolk who not once in their lives have the opportunity to attend an Ordination service. And in many dioceses the difficulties are too great to make it possible for the bishop to ordain at different centres at each of the seasons. So the parochial clergy must supply, at the Ember seasons, what, in the cathedral city, the service itself will do for those who are present at it. Why should there not be, once a year, a Clerical Sunday, as there is a Missionary Sunday, with special sermons and an outside preacher? It would probably be less invidious for a visiting priest to speak of the duties and responsibilities of the clerical estate than for one of the regular parochial clergy to do so. The bishop's charge to the priests, or the Ordination vows, provide ample material, and, I suspect, are quite unknown to most of our lay people; they have only to be told about it to enter sympathetically into the lives of their own clergy, and to respond to calls made upon them for service and sacrifice. Again, why should there not be a day of prayer for the clerical estate, as there is, at St. Andrew's-tide, for Missions? The Lent Ember season might well be chosen for this purpose, since people are more ready to respond to extra demands at that time. I am sure that we need only to kindle their imagination to change the whole outlook of the laity towards the Ministry, and these are, surely, some of the ways in which we can achieve this end. The practice of having boxes for Ember pence in

our churches during the week before each Ordination Sunday would become much more fruitful; if people understand, they will respond and give; a shilling a year from each communicant—that is, a penny on each Ember day—would go far towards providing the cost of training, which is so serious a stumbling-block to many at present. And not only would the means thus be found, there would, I am convinced, be a great increase in the number of candidates. It cannot be that God calls so few to this office; it must be that so few ever hear the call, and probably they have no opportunity of ever hearing it. I met a lady in Switzerland last summer, herself a communicant, and a member of what is sometimes called a “clerical family.” We discovered that we had mutual acquaintances, and in speaking of the son of one of our common friends, she said: “Oh yes, he has gone into the Church; funny, isn’t it? But he always was rather peculiar.” Then, realizing that I was a blackcoat myself, she apologized, but said: “But you know what I mean.” The moral, to my mind, is, that if people knew more of what ordination involves, if they were asked to pray regularly for the clergy, and to give for their training, as they do for missionary work overseas, they would cease to think it peculiar that a promising boy has “gone into the Church,” as the phrase goes, but, rather, would pray that one of their own sons might hear the call from God, and have grace to respond in self-dedication. Just as many a vocation to missionary work has been found by attendance at a missionary meeting, or as the result of a sermon on Missionary Sunday, so it would assuredly happen that young men would hear the voice of God calling them to serve Him in the Ministry of His Church through the voice of the preacher or the prayers of the Church, on the Sunday set apart in the way in which I suggest it might be done. The duty of supporting the work overseas by prayer and almsgiving and the supply of man-power is more generally recognized now, I suppose, than ever before in the history of the Church of England; I have no doubt but that men and women will recognize an equivalent duty with regard to the provision and spiritual support of their clergy when the matter is brought and held before their notice in this kind of way.

CONCLUSION

I have dealt with these five aspects of ministerial training, because I think they are among those of chief practical importance at the present time. I do not forget that there are other questions, too, which ought to be raised—questions forced upon us by our rapidly changing habits of life, or the need to

think out afresh some moral problems in view of our complex civilization. But the age-long Gospel will stand, and the Catholic Church with her ordered Ministry will continue till the end of time. Till He comes, men will hear the voice of the Master, "Follow Me." To His Church He entrusts the training of those who answer, "Here am I, send me." It is surely the business of the Church in our own day to see to it that vocations are not lost because they have never been heard, or that those who come forward are sent out on that perilous adventure ill-equipped for the dangers and problems of the road.

DUNCAN ARMYTAGE.

THE RELIGION OF THE INCARNATION

THE eternal truth of the Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, and the spiritual life brought into the world as a result of that event, are for the Catholic Christian the very heart of religion. The glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ is the master-light of all his seeing: communion with the Risen Lord, forever Perfect God and Perfect Man, is the centre of his religious and devotional life. Nevertheless, to many a modern man, who is *anima naturaliter christiana*, faith in the Incarnation appears impossible. Why is this so?

Perhaps one very important reason is that the doctrine is often presented in a fashion which misinterprets its essential truth, but upon which many zealous Christians have insisted in their effort to maintain the uniqueness of Christianity—the presentation of the Incarnation as the union of two absolutely antithetical and hitherto unrelated orders of being, God and Man, in a Person who is isolated from all other revelation.

But any attempt sharply to separate the historic Incarnation from God's manifold revelation through other channels is dangerous and untrue to the genius of Christianity, since the great value of the doctrine is not only that it teaches us that in Christ there is a full disclosure of the nature of God, given so that we may know in an intimate way that God is Love, and may come into a vital communion with Him, but also that it provides a key to the universe, to God, Man, and their relations to each other, so that by its light we may understand something of the ever-continued activity of God, His revelation in many modes and degrees, and in all history and all life. This paper is an attempt to suggest the significance of the Incarnation, and to grasp its meaning—necessarily an inadequate attempt—without doing injustice to the many-sided

revelation of God apart from Christ, or to the Catholic Faith that He is God and Man, perfectly united in one Person.

There is no need here for detailed examination of the life of our Lord as portrayed in the Gospels. It must suffice to say that, first of all, He is One who can confidently be described as "altogether lovely," winning men to Himself by the unsurpassed grandeur of His character. The strange fact that men of varied types—Mr. Wells, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Middleton Murry, Mr. Bruce Barton, for example—feel Him to be, in Mr. Wells's phrase, "too great for our small hearts," is perhaps enough to show that there is something extraordinarily universal about His appeal. He is One who feels and loves intensely, wins the devotion of His followers, speaks tenderly to little children, helps sick folk, scathingly rebukes the self-righteous, vigorously denounces injustice—an active warrior for righteousness, yet appropriately described as meek and lowly in heart. His most obvious trait, as Dr. F. C. Grant has put it, is "the quality of utter and consummate divine Love which filled Him." A few short years, and He is crucified in Jerusalem because He persists in His belief that God will redeem the world through Him, even through His death.

In the second place, then, He believed Himself to be in some sense the supreme and final messenger of God, by whose action a new and supernatural order of society would be inaugurated, a reign of love which, in the apocalyptic terminology of His day, He called "the Kingdom of God." And finally, there was some more-than-human quality about Him; as Professor Bethune-Baker once wrote: "There was a veil of mystery surrounding Him, suggesting more than met the eye or found expression in act or word." There was a numinous or holy quality which set Him apart from other men.

Our Lord may thus be called the very embodiment of holy, creative goodness. He was the perfect expression of that ideal towards which man has ever struggled—the ideal of holy Love. In the thoughtful words of Dr. Streeter: "We cannot long reflect on the life and character of Christ without perceiving that it is a perfect embodiment in concrete experience of an ideal principle—the principle of Creative Love." The appearance of Jesus Christ in human history, showing in its perfection that ideal goodness which is indeed found in some degree in all men, must raise the ultimate question: How can this unique personality be explained? Can this perfection be "merely human"?

But even then the most important fact of all has not been considered. It is that something new has come into the world with Jesus Christ—a river of divine life and power which flows

from Him to all who will make contact with Him. And this implies His continued personal activity, as the Risen and Ascended Lord, who can and does come into contact with His disciples. His immediate followers could not find words adequate to express this abundant life in Christ. It made them new creatures, they said; it turned their lives upside down, and then turned the ancient world upside down too. It will do the same thing now if we will give it the opportunity. Men would not be bothering about Jesus Christ today if this extraordinary fact were not true. And a new fellowship, the Holy Catholic Church, came into being through Him, and claims to be sustained by Him. As Dr. Burkitt has remarked, the present existence of the Christian Church "makes us consider . . . carefully the terms in which we ought to speak of Jesus, through whose action the Church came into being, and to whom the Church still persists in looking as the present source of its life."

Evidently no one has ever made so much difference, either to individuals or to human society. Without doubt this one Person "has brought, and continues to bring, a new quality or spiritual life into humanity." He has entered into men's lives, irradiating them with a supernatural loveliness, filling them with divine energy, firing them with the desire to serve their brethren for His sake, making them sharers through Him in the fullness of the Divine Life. Our Lord has been primarily the Saviour, the Life-Bringer, the Revealer who is Himself the content of the Revelation which He gives.

Since He did, and still does, these astonishing things, can He be less than "God from God, Light from Light, Very God from Very God," made man for our salvation? Are we not justified in saying with that great Catholic thinker, von Hügel, that Jesus holds in "His human mind and will as much of God, of God pure, as human nature, at its best and when most completely supernaturalized, can be made by God to hold, whilst remaining genuine human nature still"?

The Christian, then, points to the Crucifix and says: "I cannot demonstrate it by infallible proof, but my faith, confirmed by the witness of ten thousand times ten thousand, is that God Himself is right there. God is not only like that: that is God." He affirms that a universe "which could produce Christ must be produced by Christ," and declares that in the life of our Blessed Lord we see the express image of Deity, and from Him receive the Divine Life in all its richness. Here, where God and man are in "perfect interpenetration," complete union, is Divine Reality made flesh. We are given, not interesting facts about God, but God Himself, "His presence

and His very self." "The inner Reality of the universe has looked into human eyes through the eyes of Jesus Christ."

Robert Bridges, in *The Testament of Beauty*, has expressed this central conviction of Christianity in these lines:

" . . . Christ's humanity is God's personality,
And communion with Him is the life of the soul. . . .
And in the fellowship of the friendship of Christ
God is seen as the very self-essence of love,
Creator and Mover of all as active Lover of all."

But it must always be remembered that the doctrine of the Incarnation does not in any sense deny the fact of God's self-manifestation before and after the historic life of Jesus Christ. It simply and plainly declares that in this long process of Divine revelation our Lord is the complete and adequate embodiment of the Divine Essence in terms of human nature. The faith affirms that this is a "life which is at once everywhere creaturely and yet also everywhere more than creaturely, because its limitations, circumscriptions, and infirmities, whatever they may be, interpose no obstacle to the divine and eternal purpose which controls and shines through it, but are themselves vehicles of that purpose." This is "the undemonstrated and undemonstrable conviction which gives the Christian religion its specific character," continues Professor Taylor, from whose Gifford Lectures we have quoted. But this conviction makes Christianity, for such as accept it, the "final" religion.

A brief section on this question of finality may perhaps be permitted at this point. If Christ be regarded merely as teacher or prophet, the claim to finality is absurd; but when the doctrine of the Incarnation is accepted, the story is quite different. If Jesus Christ is God Incarnate, His revelation is absolute, because "the quality of Divine Spirit is forever focussed in Christ," even though there may be infinite expansion in our knowledge of God. As Dr. Orchard has said: "The revelation in Christ may be extended to infinity and must be. . . . It will never be contradicted. In that sense it is sufficient and final. It reveals God so that there is nothing more that need be misunderstood, even if there remains much not yet understood." But there is no finality *within* the Christian revelation. Rather, there is room for everlasting growth, "until we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." For "now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

To return to our main subject, it must be apparent that

there are grades of revelation. But "there is no room for the Christian conception of the Incarnation in a rigidly immanentist philosophy," as Dr. H. M. Relton has wisely pointed out. While the transcendent God comes in some degree to all men, indwelling them with the Divine Life, the whole point of Christianity is that the incorporation of God in the human nature of Christ is absolute and unique. "In Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." There is a difference between immanence and incarnation (as Mr. Davenport has ably argued), but this does not deny the organic connection between them. "To insist that the Christian conception of God and of God's Presence is incarnational is not to disesteem those other Divine activities and self-manifestations which cannot be so described. The incarnational is not the enemy, but the crown and complement, of the immanental." Here Dr. Selwyn has put the entire matter in a few words. And from this point of view, the Incarnation and its extension in the Church may be regarded as the climax of the eternal outgoing activity of God, here reaching full and adequate expression and extended through our Lord in His Church to the entire human race.

It may even be said that our Saviour is perfectly and absolutely what every man is imperfectly and potentially, and what each one of us may through Him become. In Jesus Christ, God and man are united in a hypostatic union: He is the God-Man. In us, who have been made in God's Image (which is Jesus Christ), and in whom God deigns to dwell by His Spirit, the penetration of the temporal by the eternal is broken and imperfect. "Everywhere," says Professor F. Heiler, "the Eternal God opens up to us His Infinite love and grace. . . . Everywhere the Logos is at work, illuminating, guiding, helping and healing, sending out His beams in all directions, but in the Incarnate, Risen and Ever-living Christ these radiant beams are focussed into one clear and burning flame."

So understood, the Incarnation opens up wide vistas, showing God's universal care for all His children. We may understand that those who have not known the historic Christ, or who because of "invincible ignorance" cannot accept Him, are not without some light from the Eternal Father of lights. Christians have indeed been granted the fuller vision. But this is an occasion for humility, for humble acceptance of God's free riches in Christ Jesus, and a thankful proclamation to all men of the love which has been shown to us.

And yet emphasis on the historic aspect of the faith is imperative. The historic Redeemer is the safeguard not only against charges of subjectivism, but also against theories which

would regard Christianity as one of a number of equally satisfactory myths portraying an entirely ineffable reality. Christians do not worship an ideal, a projection, a beautiful myth, a divine avatar, a philosophical concept; they adore the God who has been "given" (as von Hügel always insisted) in an historic personality.

"The signal to a maid, the human birth,
The lesson and the Young Man crucified."

If men would know God as He really and essentially is, they must look for Him where in the Person of Jesus Christ He has actually come in His fullness into the heart of our little human life, living, loving, teaching, suffering, dying and rising again. This historic *fact* is the crown and criterion of all revelation.

But, on the other hand, the communion of the Christian with his Lord has never meant, at any rate to the Catholic Church, the following of an historic figure. It has meant an actual grafting of the individual Christian into Christ, so that he is a "very member incorporate in His mystical Body." We have both the Jesus of history and the Christ of experience, and both are necessary. For it is "through the wounds of His humanity that we come to the intimacy of His divinity."

The Incarnation is no mere event of the past; it will never come to an end. Not only is Jesus Christ God united with manhood now and forever; but the Catholic Church is continuing the Incarnation, mediating the same Divine Life that was given to our Lord. Even as the definitive revelation in Christ was preceded by other (though lesser) revelations, so now the Catholic Church carries on this divine process of self-giving, but on the new and higher plane to which it was lifted by our Lord. This is to be extended to the whole world, for it is only thus that we can learn the full meaning of the Incarnation. "A Person came and lived and loved and did and taught and died and rose again and lives on by His power and His Spirit forever within us and amongst us, so divinely above us precisely in being so divinely near, so unspeakably rich and yet so simple, so sublime and yet so homely, that His character and teaching require, for an ever fuller yet never complete understanding, the varying study and different experiments and applications, embodiments and unrollings, of all the races of civilizations, of all the individual and corporate, the simultaneous and successive, experiences of the human race to the end of time." So Baron von Hügel has expressed the point which we are endeavouring to make.

In conclusion, we may say that our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ is not the only, but the supreme and definitive manifesta-

tion of the Eternal God; who interprets all other revealers and fulfils their partial revelations, crowning the long-continued process of Divine self-impartation and lifting manhood to "the level of Deity." Such a religion is for all men, everywhere, the poor and humble, the rich and wise; in it there are "pools where lambs may drink and depths where elephants can swim," as St. Augustine once remarked.

Indeed, the Incarnation is the very heart of religion and of life, for both are summed up in Christ, who is Perfect Love.

"Worship we the Godhead,
Love incarnate, Love divine;
Worship we our Jesus:
But wherewith for sacred sign?

"Love shall be our token,
Love be yours and love be mine,
Love to God and all men,
Love for plea and gift and sign."

PRINCETON, U.S.A.

W. NORMAN PITTENGER.

THE SECOND COMING OF OUR LORD

THE indwelling of Christ in His Body, the Church, and its members, and the second coming of our Lord in glory, are two basic and indispensable truths of the Catholic religion. The point is, they are two truths, not one. The western, Romano-Protestant world, with its genius for putting apart what God has joined together, has frequently held one-sidedly to one or the other of these doctrines, and neglected the counter truth. The Eastern Orthodox Church has kept a more even balance, and emphasized them both aright. But no one, I believe, until very modern times, has suggested that the Pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit, and the resulting presence of Christ in the Church and in the souls of Christians, was to be identified with the second coming of the Son of Man. There is not one vestige of Catholic authority for this view, which simply denies or explains away a fundamental article of the Church's Creed. Nor is there, as I hope to show, any real evidence in the New Testament for identifying, or rather confusing, the two.

The origin of the Messianic hope is shrouded in obscurity. Various strands enter into it—the conception of the conquering King and of the apocalyptic Son of Man, etc., which, though widely different, are by no means irreconcilable, or incapable of being woven together when given the more spiritual content our Lord imparts to them. Human hopes and aspirations

entered into the conception, and conditioned to some degree the form in which the Revelation was given. Yet it would be a mistake to attribute everything to the human factors, and lose sight of the Divine overruling. Catholic Christians can recognize to the full the human historic conditionings of any belief, and yet realize at the same time that every belief which belongs to the core of the Judeo-Christian tradition—as the apocalyptic coming of the Messiah certainly does—is inspired by God, and has some vital, practical bearing on our spiritual life and outlook. To lose sight of this fact is to head straight for a rationalism which ultimately makes shipwreck of the Christian faith.

The return of our Lord in glory to judge the world is as clearly and unmistakably taught in the Synoptic Gospels as in the Nicene Creed. Three events are plainly foretold—the abiding presence of Christ, or His Spirit (the one involves the other), the destruction of Jerusalem, and the coming of our Lord at the end of the world, or better, at the consummation of the age. Undoubtedly passages or phrases applied by our Lord to one of these were sometimes misunderstood and misapplied by the disciples to others, but to omit any one of the three, or merge them together, is a process which can be achieved only by ruthlessly tearing out whole sections of the New Testament, and treating the record in the fashion of the wildest and most radical critics. A sane criticism cannot proceed in this manner. Of course apocalyptic language and expressions are used—part of the conventional “stage scenery”—which to the literal-minded must seem crude, but which, when received in the poetic spirit in which they were uttered, are a natural attempt to indicate things unprecedented, beyond all experience of man. The essential fact remains unshaken.

But the Fourth Gospel, too, teaches the second coming of our Lord, and does not confuse this coming with the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost. The Fourth Gospel, to be sure, gives greater prominence than the Synoptics to the indwelling of Christ within us, as would be expected of a writer of such spiritual depth after a lifetime of experience of intimate union with his Lord. But the other truth is there too. In a sense, life is already given to men, for He who is the Life and the Resurrection is in our midst (John v. 25, xi. 25). But in another sense, life in its fullness is yet to be given, and the Resurrection of the dead, to life or to condemnation, lies in the future (John v. 28-29). And in relation to both stages—the present, transitional stage, and the future consummation—Christ is the judge. There is the presence now; there is the coming and the Resurrection “at the last day” (John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54). The reiteration of this phrase is surely most significant. There is a

sense in which the presence of Jesus will be withdrawn from the world (John xii. 8), to be restored, of course, "at the last day." In a sense the process of judgment is going on now, for the Light is come into the world, and men love the darkness rather than the Light because their deeds are evil. The separation is already taking place. But the completion of this process—its revelation and consummation—is yet to come. The word which Christ has spoken, the same shall judge men "at the last day" (John xii. 48). Christ is to come, in a sense at Pentecost, when the Spirit is given (John xiv. 18), yet there is another sense, in which He is coming at the end, or consummation of the world-process (John xxi. 22). There is no contradiction between the two; equally there is no confusion of the one with the other. Of course, these passages may be explained away, or manipulated beyond recognition, or arbitrarily expunged; and in this way, the Fourth Gospel may be brought into seeming conflict with the Synoptics. This same type of criticism, however, discards the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection—in fact anything it does not like or fails to appreciate—by similar methods. I readily admit that the second coming (or if one wills, the third coming) of Christ is not so prominent in the Fourth Gospel as in the others, while His indwelling presence receives greater emphasis. This is quite easily accounted for by the nature of the Gospel itself—its supplementary relation to the others. As well use the omission of the institution of the Eucharist (as some do) to prove that the writer denies or disparages the rite.

The rest of the Johannine literature bears a similar witness. Christ dwells within us, the Holy Spirit abides in us, we are already sons of God—yet there awaits us a consummation beyond our present conceptions, beyond our wildest imaginings, when Christ shall again appear. "Beloved, now are we sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is" (1 John iii. 2).

So, too, in the Pauline epistles, we may detect a shift from the expectation of an *immediate* return of Christ to that of a more remote coming: there is not the slightest evidence for the abandonment of the belief itself, *i.e.* of the Parousia. St. Paul held the complementary truths—the indwelling of Christ in us, and His return to judgment together—in his latest writings, as well as in the earlier. Thus we find them emphasized together in the well-known passage in Colossians (iii. 1-4). Already we are risen with Christ; already we are identified and united with Him; already our life is "hid with Christ in God." Yet in the very next verse we are told that "when Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also be manifested with Him

in glory." Already, in a relative sense, we have been made "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light" (i. 12), yet, in the absolute sense, we look forward to receiving "the reward of the inheritance" (iii. 24, 25). Christ in one sense has come, in another comes continually (in Holy Communion, etc.), in another is yet to come. So, too, the kingdom in a sense has come, is among us; in another is yet to come. The first truth is, perhaps, more closely related to the immanence of God, or the Incarnation of His Son; the second to the transcendence of God, or the Ascension of His Son. There is no opposition between the two; no blurring of the distinction between them.

We might run through all the New Testament writers, *e.g.* Hebrews: "Yet a little while, he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry" (Heb. x. 37); James (v. 8, 9): "The coming of our Lord draweth nigh . . . the judge standeth before the door"; 1 Peter (v. 4): "When the chief Shepherd shall appear," etc.; 2 Peter, *passim*; Jude; and the Apocalypse, *passim*. Not one of the New Testament writers omits the second coming of Christ, or confuses it with the Pentecostal indwelling. Not one of them sees any contradiction between the two. It has remained for modern Liberal Protestantism to find a divergence where none exists, and put asunder two truths which in the Revelation of God and the religion of His Church stand together. To do this is surely to abandon belief in the inspiration of the New Testament, in any real and intelligible sense (I am not, of course, speaking of the Fundamentalist sense), and in the Holy Spirit's guidance of the Church.

For the Catholic Church, both Western and Eastern, has always considered, and still considers, the coming of Christ in glory an essential article of her Creed. Androutsos, in his *Δογματική*, accounts it one of "the fundamental bases of the faith" (I have not the volume before me, but am sure I have quoted it practically verbatim); Khomiakov, Soloviev, Zankov, Arseniev, Berdiaeff, and other Liberal Orthodox writers teach the same truth. The whole Church, East and West alike, holds this belief as true and essential. If we can discard it by a piece of self-sufficient individualism, despising the organic witness of the Spirit-guided body, we can surely discard any and all of the remaining articles of the faith. The authority of the Church becomes an absurdity, the guidance of the Spirit becomes meaningless, unless we are to fall into the manifest impiety of supposing that the Holy Spirit contradicts Himself, guiding the Church to teach one thing universally for the first nineteen centuries of her career, and its opposite thereafter. Such a view would justify the jibe of Roman Catholic controversialists

that "Liberal Catholicism" in the Anglican Church is only a poorly disguised Modernism; is really only an advanced stage of Protestantism and Rationalism. The Spirit of God, speaking through the Scriptures and the Church, utters His voice in no uncertain terms; let us take pains to echo, not to contradict, His teaching.

It is no accident, surely, that the Orthodox Eastern Church, which has the keenest sense of the indwelling of Christ in His Spirit-bearing Body, the Church, and in all her members, is also the most eschatological in outlook of all the historic Churches, and has a special love for the Apocalypse. For she realizes that the presence of the Spirit within us now is the foretaste, the pledge (*ἀρραβών*), of the more glorious consummation to come. This has given her the deep, mystical, otherworldly atmosphere and orientation which we in the West so sorely need, and for lack of which our Christianity is so diluted and secularized. The East has something to learn from the West; but on this point, at least, the West has much to learn from the East.

In the person of our Saviour, the purpose of creation—the union of Creator and creature—is already perfectly achieved. Salvation is potentially complete. But the embodiment of God in the Church—the social incarnation of Christ, if we may venture so to speak—is far from complete, it is a long-drawn-out historical process, and the end is not yet in sight. "We see not yet all things put under Him," the new creation is not yet perfect or finished, "but we see Jesus," we see the Head and Fount of that new creation and its goal, "crowned with glory and honour." In the Ascension of our brother and our God, we see alike the source of the Church's supernatural life and the goal to which she is predestined. But the difference between our present imperfection and the God-given perfection of the glorified Church is a difference, not of degree, but of kind. There is something cataclysmic about it, as about every new stage of God's creative work. The completion of the work of creation and redemption, the investing of every ideal content with a perfect form which is involved in the Resurrection, the transfiguration of the entire universe, material and spiritual, as the Temple of God, wherein God shall be "all in all"—all this is the Divine achievement, promised at the end of this world's history, to which we look forward, and for which we strive to fit ourselves. It is our hope, our inspiration, and our joy.

Do we not need to take to heart the searching criticism of Berdiaeff: "The Western world behaves in regard to all this (the return of Christ to judgment, the resurrection and the transfiguration of all creation, the establishment of the Kingdom of God) as if it would never happen. . . . Its city is here on

earth, and it is busy enlarging and perfecting it." Can we not, fully realizing the blessed presence of the Spirit in our hearts, of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of His love and through it in the souls of His members, yet pray earnestly, in the language of the earliest Eucharistic prayer: "May grace come, and this world pass away"? Maranatha! May He come quickly. Even so, Lord Jesus, come!

WILLIAM H. DUNPHY.

THE WEAK THINGS OF THE WORLD

AFTER the setting forth of the glories of the inheritance of the Christian in Ephesians i.-iii., it seems almost an anticlimax to come to walking "worthy" of it "with all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (iv. 1-3). These virtues are excellent to live with, and we pay them lip-homage, but do we not want something more energetic for getting things done and bringing in the Kingdom? Yet when we find them constantly recurring in St. Paul's practical application of his teaching (cp. Gal. v. 22, 23; Col. iii. 12-15; 1 Tim. vi. 11, 12; 2 Tim. ii. 24; Tit. iii. 1-2, see also 1 Pet. iii. 8, 9) and remember that St. Paul was essentially a man who did get things done, and who constantly uses metaphors of warfare in connection with them, we are led to ask if these apparently milder qualities, rightly used, may not have an energy of their own. The writer of Isaiah liii. thought so, for seeking the qualities of the final deliverer he finds them in one marked by lowliness and insignificance and the guiltless suffering of despise; "therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong."

On our planet we have space of three dimensions, up and down, backwards and forwards, and sideways. In outer space, when our standard of comparison has gone, the directions disappear and only the three dimensions remain. Similarly in our conditions of time and society some qualities and positions are ranked as higher and more honourable than others; we might arrange them somewhat like this:

Father	force	authority	dignity	power	riches	master
Son	weakness	obedience	humility	lowliness	poverty	servant.

Are they so when taken out of our order into the eternal order, or are some absolutely supreme and others only relatively or not at all, the standard of comparison being changed?

Our only example and final authority on eternal conditions is Christ, and not only is He, though very definitely "the Master" and claiming to be the Stronger than the "strong man," held up as an example of these very qualities which we are inclined to look upon as less effective (Phil. ii. 1-8; 1 Pet. iii. 8-9), but He gives them a great place in His teaching on the character of the Kingdom (Matt. v. 1-11; Luke vi. 20-26).

He claims to be Himself essentially meek and lowly in heart (Matt. xi. 29), He did His mighty works without worldly advantage of position, reputation, or education. Such things are apparently not necessary for the success of the Kingdom, and when the Young Ruler, possessing them all, offered himself as a disciple he was told to begin by getting rid of them as far as possible. Worldly advantage is not to be expected, but rather service (Mark x. 42-45; Luke xxii. 25-27); He is Himself the Servant; wealth is rather a drawback than not (Mark x. 23-25); self-expression may have to be curtailed, even to the loss of eye or hand, and life itself lost to gain life (ix. 43, viii. 35). What the world reckons as positions from which things may be "done," He seemed to value little, He could work without them, and apparently few of His pioneers were chosen from the influential classes. They were weak things (1 Cor. i. 27, 28).

When it comes to action it is the same thing.

The New Testament is thrown on a background of conflict of spiritual forces. One of the lessons we learnt during the war was that the weapon which the enemy finds it most difficult to counter is one which he does not possess himself (for example, tanks). If the same principle applies in spiritual matters may we see that while the "world" possesses force, pride, riches, position—the devil was not contradicted when he claimed that the kingdoms of the world were his—it has not got the characteristics of the Kingdom, humility, poverty of spirit, obedience, and claims to look upon them as rather pitiable, if not as a "slave morality." But what if that very fact shows them to be good fighting qualities? (cp. 1 Cor. i. 26-28: the choice of the weak and despised things, not only to be saved, but to bring to nought the strong and wise of the world), and what if it is our part as soldiers of Christ to release just those powers which the enemy cannot counter effectively? "The weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh," but none the less "mighty" in the warfare with evil.

The more we read of books like *The Universe Around Us* the more we are struck with the infinite resources of power at Christ's disposal "through whom all things were made." But it is even more striking that, as manifested in our order, He makes sparing use of them, and considerable use of these powers of

weakness. If His revelation of the Godhead is true this can be no mere accommodation to our order, but because of some eternal value in them, by which they are more effective and penetrating than those which seem to us to be stronger.

It is difficult to know what terms to use in speaking of the conflict of spiritual forces on an invisible plane of being, whether to speak of them as neutralizing or defeating each other. Throughout the Old Testament and the New, special emphasis is laid on pride as one of the qualities essentially opposed to God. How was the spirit of pride affected by the humiliation of the Incarnate Lord—His birth into poverty; His obligation for food and shelter to Joseph and Mary, His own creatures; His working for a living and receiving payment for His handiwork; His life as a wandering Teacher, dependent on the gifts of His creatures; the meekness and lowliness which did all with perfect simplicity and made Him readily accessible to all who needed Him? Did He thereby in some way effectively "mortify" the sin of pride?

Again we see in the accounts of the two great temptations (Gen. iii. and Matt. iv.) the suggestion of reaching the appointed goal by other than the appointed means, the temptation to self-assertion, independence, and disobedience. Christ chose the long way of obedience and dependence. It is notable that the Fourth Gospel, where His divinity is most asserted, is also most explicit upon this obedience and dependence (v. 19, 30; xii. 49; xiv. 10, 24, etc.). He is obedient not only to the Father, but in His youth, as is specially mentioned, to Joseph and Mary (Luke ii. 51). He was recognized by the centurion, who knew the signs, as one under obedience, and His authority was derived from that obedience to unlimited might. "I must," He says. The Scriptures "must" be fulfilled. His independence of men and of tradition was based on a higher obedience which led Him to the Cross. How did this resolute obedience react on the disobedience and independence of the world?

We see, too, His patience and long-suffering with the slowness of His disciples and throughout the attacks made on Him personally as distinguished from His mission; and the love which did all without talking about itself, but went all lengths for the beloved. But He claims no credit for them. Once, indeed, He says, "I am meek and lowly of heart," and at the end of St. John, "I have loved you." But all is done without ostentation or appeal. Does this strike at the love of recognition and of receiving honour from men?

There is, too, a turning of the enemy's weapons against himself by the manner of accepting and making use of what to others is a powerful deterrent, not seeking relief from it, but

going through with it. He started with a full measure of what we call handicaps—poverty, lack of backing, lack of educational standing. He was met by all that we are accustomed to avoid—suffering, shame, defeat, failure, disappointment, falling away of friends—and accepted it voluntarily as a means to victory (Phil. ii. 8, 9; Col. ii. 14). At the heart of the Gospel is the God who, as man, in pain and rejection, crucified "I." We by nature prefer deliverance to endurance. He with power to deliver Himself chose to endure, and "crucified through weakness" (2 Cor. xiii. 4) won the victory over death.

St. Paul, then, is only following His leading when he says: "I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong" (2 Cor. xii. 9, 10); and from St. Paul to Florence Buchanan the principle has proved true.

Suffering, mental and physical too, is taken up and used. Through the sufferings of Christ we are redeemed. The disciples were warned that it was to be expected (Matt. x. 16-33, etc.), and that in its right use was blessedness (v. 10, 12). Sufferings were cheerfully accepted by the early Church as a matter of course. St. Paul even finds them a source of rejoicing (Rom. v. 3, viii. 18; Col. i. 24) as a part of his service. Later saints, too, not only Catherine of Siena and St. Theresa, have believed that suffering could be, if rightly used, a potent factor in spiritual warfare.

It is interesting, too, to see what qualities the early Church sought in its bishops. Then, if ever, one would have thought, men were wanted with outstanding powers of leadership. We find "But thou, O man of God . . . follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith" (1 Tim. vi. 11, 12). This to a man whose position was not very well assured (iv. 12). But it is a fighting exhortation. The characteristics required for other bishops and leading men do not make mention of force of character or mental capacity—except that a bishop should be a good teacher (1 Tim. iii. 1-13).

From those days on, other followers have taken and wielded one or other of these milder virtues as a potent weapon. Martyrs overcame torture by undergoing it with a smile, and death by dying. As Browning saw (*Instans Tyrannus*), the man who can endure to the end dies victorious and baffles all the powers arrayed against him. Francis was only one of those who have joyfully wielded poverty, not as a negative but a positive weapon of the Kingdom. Theresa bears witness to the value of obedience as a spiritual force. The China Inland Mission works in absolute dependence upon God for supplies, and in

1930, a year when all other Societies were straitened for funds, they received in England £115,000 as against £64,000 in 1929. Some of it, indeed, was for a special purpose, but missionary societies all have special purposes, and this was provided for.

It would take too long to work out all the implications of this suggestion; they can only be hinted at.

Christ showed these qualities in action and claimed to be co-equal God. Does that mean that in the eternal order we may have to rearrange our ideas of powers and values? Are these qualities not, as we are apt to think, possibly best suited to pious and elderly women and the "inferior clergy," but co-equal and reciprocal with those we ascribe to the Father? Christ is, says the writer to the Hebrews, the *χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*, the impression of the Father as of a seal. Now the seal and its stamp are not identical but reciprocal. They fit into each other. Their relation is therefore closer than two similar seals or two impressions of the same seal, and these qualities which we have looked upon as in some way less honourable may have their equal place in the Godhead with those which we have held to be greater.

Should we then arrange our values somewhat on this fashion: Father-Son, might-lowliness, lordship-service, dignity-humility, authority-obedience? As our place in the Kingdom is "in Christ," that is in the Son, we see that those qualities which we are apt to reckon as the weaker specially belong to our relationship.

A good deal of our warfare is carried on on the invisible plane and with invisible weapons. There is great talk at present of the lack of power in the Church. Is it possible that we have not learnt to use our weakness properly? Have we, as the Archbishop of York suggests, got our labels wrong?

M. D. R. WILLINK.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue, the Rev. Duncan Armytage is Warden of St. Anselm's Hall, Manchester; the Rev. W. Norman Pittenger and the Rev. William H. Dunphy write from America, the latter being Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Nashotah. Miss Willink is on the staff of the S.P.C.K., and is known to readers of this Journal through former contributions.

We have received a copy of a contribution to "The Lambeth Series," entitled *A Free Church Impression*, by Sir Henry Lunn (Nisbet and Company, 1s.). If anyone may be called the veteran of the Reunion movement, Sir Henry is the man; and his long association with it gives a particular interest to what he has to say. The booklet provides, in fact, a bird's-eye view of the issue, so far as the Church of England and the Free Churches are concerned, from 1867 onwards, and we see how the work of men like Pusey and Hugh Price Hughes found fruit in the Grindelwald Conference of 1892. These early days are important for another reason; for they help to explain why the declaration as to the "real ministries" of the Word and Sacrament in non-episcopal bodies was "side-tracked" at the Lambeth Conference of 1930. In 1867 and 1878, as in 1930, the Lambeth Conference was dealing with practical issues of administration, and the discussion of phrases that were both ambiguous and controversial would certainly have delayed matters. The procedure of the Conference here was not so much Anglican as English, and we should expect our Nonconformist brethren to realize it. Sir Henry, indeed, we believe, does so. And a similar explanation applies to the prominent attention which Lambeth gave to negotiations with the Eastern and Old Catholic representations. The issues were far more ripe there for immediate and far-reaching practical decisions than was the case with the Free Churches.

Sir Henry makes a good deal of Resolution 42: but we suspect that, if it proves to be pregnant with consequences beneficial to Reunion, it will be in virtue of principles of "economy" borrowed from the East.

DOCUMENT

[THE following is the text of the statement of Eucharistic belief issued in October as a result of a Conference held under the Chairmanship of the Master of the Temple, to which allusion is made in our Editorial this month.—ED.]

EUCCHARISTIC DOCTRINE

Acknowledging that, inasmuch as God is Love, the Life of God the Son, alike in the eternal sphere and in its earthly manifestation, is a life of self-giving to the Father, we believe:

- (1) That our Lord, on the eve of His Passion, instituted the Sacrament of Holy Communion in remembrance of Himself and for the special commemoration of His Death, and that the Church has

therefore been right in regarding the Eucharist as the most sacred act in her worship;

(2) That the Lord, who has promised to abide for ever with His Church, is Himself the real Minister in every Sacrament, using by the operation of the Holy Spirit the visible acts and audible words of an earthly minister;

(3) That the Consecration is the Act of the unseen Lord, in response to the liturgical prayer and action, taken as a whole, in which the officiating priest and the worshippers alike have their share;

(4) That such Consecration has a real effect, since the consecrated Elements are, by the Will of God, now charged with a new spiritual significance and purpose, being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ;

(5) That, while the Consecration passes into effect in virtue of the Divine Will and the intention of the Church as a whole, the benefit of reception is dependent upon the faith and dispositions of the worshipper;

(6) That the Divine Liturgy constitutes one whole, in which the reception of the sacred Elements forms an essential part;

(7) That the Celebration of the Liturgy shows forth our Lord's Sacrifice as that which has, once for all, reconciled the world to God;

(8) That our Lord's Sacrifice, which reached its climax at Calvary, was completed by His Resurrection and Ascension, whereby His incarnate life was carried forward into the unveiled Presence of the Father, thus establishing a new relation of mankind to God;

(9) That the virtue of our Lord's Sacrifice was made available for us through the coming of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, when the Church became the agent of His redemptive purpose;

(10) That as the Risen and Ascended Christ is ever with the Father as the Royal High-Priest of mankind, so at the Lord's Table we celebrate and make before the Divine Majesty the Memorial which He has willed, becoming thus united with our Lord in His Sacrifice, which sustains the new moral and spiritual order prepared for redeemed humanity;

and we affirm that the faithful use of the Lord's Supper can alone reveal its inexhaustible meaning, and that in the unity of experience we shall draw nearer to unity in belief.

TWO NOTES ON THE VIRGIN BIRTH

1. St. James, the Lord's brother, was presiding over the Church at Jerusalem when St. Luke visited Palestine with St. Paul, about 59 A.D., and remained there apparently during the two years St. Paul was in prison at Cæsarea. The material found in Luke i. and ii. is clearly of Palestinian and Semitic origin, and it is natural to suppose that St. Luke acquired it during these two years.* That is to say, the story of the birth of Jesus from the Virgin Mother was current in Palestine thirty years after the Crucifixion. It became current, if it was not there from the first, and superseded an earlier account which made Joseph the physical

* For a justification of this, which to some will seem an almost naïve simplification, see the essay on "The Virgin Birth" in the writer's *New Testament Problems*.

father of Jesus, *if such an account ever existed*, during a time when James was the outstanding figure in the Palestinian Church—namely, the seventeen years or so following Peter's departure from Jerusalem recorded in Acts xii.

Now, if we may disregard the view that makes "brother" equivalent to "cousin," James the brother of the Lord, whatever his relation to the Virgin Mary, was the son of Joseph. Had a tradition existed in the family that Joseph was the actual as well as the putative father of Jesus, the honour accruing to Joseph would have been great from the first. It is inconceivable that James would have allowed a story to gain credence which robbed his father of this wonderful dignity.

A friendly critic, to whom this line of argument was developed, replied that it was dangerous, since it might lead people to another conclusion, that, if Joseph was not the Lord's father, then there might be something after all in the Jewish slander of an illegitimate birth.

We ought not to be afraid of the challenge, the existence of which is clearly indicated in Matt. i. For we have only to think ourselves back into the atmosphere of the early Palestinian Church to realize the absurdity of the suggestion. Human nature in such cases can be relied upon to act in accordance with common sense. Had there been anything to hush up in connection with the birth of Jesus, it is inconceivable that the accusation would have been met by the invention of a Virgin Birth legend. In the absence of anything to justify it in Jewish beliefs, the Christians would have been charged with promulgating a legend drawn from pagan sources which in the nature of the case proved the truth of the slander. No, the obvious reaction to such a charge, had it been levelled in the earliest period, would have been to declare that Joseph was the real as well as the putative father of Jesus. The slander hinted at in Matt. i. is then the Jewish reply to an already existing story of the Virgin Birth.

2. Why did God use the method of a Virginal Conception for the birth of His only Son? This is a real difficulty to some, who feel that the sanctity of married life is depreciated thereby. A stainless human being, they say, could spring from two parents as easily as from one. The miracle is otiose and a needless burden upon faith. To this we may reply:

(a) There is a radical difference between men and women in their attitude towards sex. Therefore an Annunciation to a man parallel to that to Mary is unthinkable. Mary co-operated with perfect purity, faith, and simplicity. Joseph, owing to the element of guilt unconsciously associated with sex in men's minds, was psychologically incapable of such co-operation.

(b) In God's providence the full status of woman has come through the honour given to Mary. Had the Saviour of the world been a *man*, and begotten of a human *father*, the part played by the mother would have been regarded as subordinate, and woman would never have attained her full dignity.

W. K. L. C.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

The Journal of Religion. Vol. xi., No. 3.

This journal opens with an appreciation of the work and gifts of Professor von Harnack. We could wish to see more of this sort of work published in it. A criticism of Absolutism, part of a dissertation for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Yale University, is also to be commended; but we confess to some doubts concerning the value of studying the Gospel according to Mark, with particular reference to its plot and its chief character, Jesus, in order to reach a conclusion that the Man of Nazareth is to be classed among the outstanding tragic figures of the race, and that the Second Gospel comes under the classification of Greek tragedy. Yet Ernest W. Burch of the Garrett Biblical Institute sets himself this task.

H. S. M.

The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought. Vol. viii., No. 4.

In common with other religious papers the other side of the Atlantic, this publication is anxious about its future. In a modest Editorial the question whether the journal is worth preserving is asked, and the suggestion made that if so there might be the proof of an increased number of subscribers. For our own part, we should answer Yes to the Editor's question, and we hope he will meet with the encouragement of an increased circulation. The present number contains an interesting discussion of Plato as a Modernist who adopted much the same line towards Homer as do moderate critics towards the Bible. We would also single out for notice Dr. Hurst's paper in which he takes the post-resurrection appearances of our Lord between the first appearance in the garden and the final appearance on the hill in Galilee, to point out that in each of them the presence of Jesus was connected with a meal. "If the underlying *motif* of post-Resurrection appearances was the disciples' belief that Jesus was present at the feast, we have a real clue to the nature of those appearances. His presence was made known in the breaking of bread." There is, too, a suggestive analysis of Habakkuk, setting out the prophecy as a Liturgy in which three voices alternately are heard—the voice of the Prophet, the voice of God, and the voice of the Congregation; as Challenge-Response, Taunt Song on the King of Babylon, Divine Theophany, and the Congregation's answering hymn of Faith.

H. S. M.

REVIEWS

THE MEANING OF THE REVELATION. By Philip Carrington.
S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

THE Revelation of St. John the Divine occupies an unique position among the books of the New Testament, since it appears to be far removed from them both in idiom and in texture, and even farther removed than they from the idiom and from the texture of modern literature. It is so difficult that it is useful to the Hyde Park heckler and to the religious charlatan alike. Consequently it is shunned by the ordinary Christian, and its inclusion in the New Testament Canon, like the inclusion of the Book of Daniel in that of the Old, is sometimes regretted by the scholar.

Those few scholars who have dared to brave its problems have tended, especially more recently, to increase the difficulty of it. To some minds, no doubt, criticism of the jig-saw order is intrinsically fascinating. Probably most students of the New Testament pass through a phase during which they delight to discover some hitherto undetected primitive source peeping through the semitisms of Mark, or some novel and plausible form-giving factor lurking in the Sayings common to Matthew and Luke. But as a rule such an occupation is transitory, being natural and healthy in adolescent study of the New Testament, but often unnatural and pernicious when it has become more mature. Accordingly, now that the whole science of New Testament criticism is reaching maturity, it is becoming generally recognized that the truism is true, and that the means has no value apart from the end. It is now at last possible to anticipate a time when no commentary, however brilliant and ingenious in its analysis of the material and in its illustration of the form, which leaves it uncertain whether the book upon which it is commenting was included in the Canon by the guidance of the Spirit, or by some misapprehending error of human judgment, will be for one moment tolerated.

During the adolescence of Criticism this issue, as it is presented in the Book of Revelation, has been too frequently shirked. On the one hand, the book has been held to be little more than an unintelligent Christian *réchauffé* of Judaic apocalyptic; on the other hand, it has been found to be an extremely ingenious, and at the same time stupid, compilation of quotations and tag-ends. Neither of these "results" of literary criticism explains its place in the Canon.

It is most significant, then, that just as criticism of the rest of the New Testament is beginning to face the fundamental theological issues laid bare by literary analysis, criticism of the Book of Revelation, as represented by Mr. Philip Carrington, should be facing the same issues. Mr. Carrington firmly refuses to be led into the by-ways of source and form-analysis. No doubt the Revelation is composite—its author, indeed, seems to have collected and arranged a number of visions dating from various periods of his prophetic life—but this, says Mr. Carrington, is “a minor matter, a piece of literary labour.” No doubt the book cannot be understood apart from some study of contemporary Jewish apocalyptic: “The influence of these books is subsidiary.” This does not mean that no account of literary influences must be taken. On the contrary, the understanding of the book depends largely on the recognition that “its form depends on ‘two main sequences,’ the prophecies of Jesus and the sequence of the prophecies of Ezekiel.” The Revelation, indeed, was written to show how the course of prophecy down to Jesus had been fulfilled. Mr. Carrington maintains this thesis very convincingly by urging with much force that by Babylon is meant Jerusalem. On this supposition alone does the book make sense. But the recognition of these influences is neither original nor the main object of Mr. Carrington’s work. This lies in the discovery that through and in the book, composite as is its material, bound up, as it seems to be, with levitical symbolism, revealing, as it appears to do, prophecies written at very different periods of the author’s spiritual life, there is a unity pre-eminently artistic and theological. The greatness of the Revelation is found in its present completed form. Mr. Carrington, indeed, cannot speak of it without becoming lyrical. “The book . . . rises to the highest poetic vision which the human mind can attain; it has passages of sheer beauty and terror utterly beyond any other writer. It is the world’s supreme masterpiece of imaginative art.” And Mr. Carrington subtends his many statements of this kind by carrying the reader—a little breathlessly at times—through a panorama of many-splendoured beauty. There is no doubt that, once the suggestive allusion and association of the symbolism is revealed, the real æsthetic value of many passages is no longer obscured. Hitherto our eyes have been blinded by perplexity—and by literary analysis. Yet it must not be thought that *The Meaning of the Revelation* is merely one more system of identification. Mr. Carrington’s method might perhaps be described as liberating the potentiality of the material so that it assumes significant form without being forced. A method of this sort is bound to be hazardous. At times,

accordingly, especially in his summary of the prophesying of Jesus, Mr. Carrington is a little dogmatic. At times, too, in his zeal to draw out the import of his material, he is a little confusing. Though denying himself any judgment upon the person of the author, he falls into partiality in his efforts to show "points of contact" between the Revelation and the Fourth Gospel. At times he makes strained and unnecessary identifications. And, more serious still perhaps, he at times mars brilliant writing with unfortunate colloquialism. But the value of *The Meaning of the Revelation* depends on none of these things, but rather upon its compelling demonstration that the author of the Revelation was a great theologian. Again and again parallels from the Pauline Epistles, from Hebrews, or from the Johannine writings, are educed to show, not a forced or shallow similarity, but an essential identity of the stuff of the author's thought. Whoever St. John might have been, he was a great thinker, meeting and solving the tremendous problems of the age in which he lived.

According to certain standards, Mr. Carrington's work is bound to be thought unscientific. For it depends largely upon "judgment," just as the worthy playing of a piece of music depends upon "interpretation." But if Mr. Carrington tried to satisfy such standards, if he descended to the lower levels of conventional commentary, it is possible that his readers would have to descend with him from the light of mountain tops to the gloom of the valley. He himself modestly claims to do no more than indicate the spiritual facts with which Revelation deals. To do so he frankly behaves as a theologian on the watch for theology. It is possible that by this method alone will further advance be made, not only in the interpretation of the Revelation, but in the interpretation of the rest of the New Testament as well.

NOEL DAVEY.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES. By Ernst Troeltsch. 2 vols. Translated by Olive Wyon. With an introductory note by Charles Gore. Allen and Unwin. 42s.

On our shelves stand three massive volumes entitled the *Gesammelte Schriften* of Ernst Troeltsch, and the first and second of these volumes contain "The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches." Now Troeltsch is a great man who gives forth great thought, yet his thought is by no means easy to follow, though assuredly it is well worth following. The translator, Miss Wyon, has performed her difficult task with con-

summate ease. She has subdivided paragraphs, and whenever possible she has broken up sentences into their constituent parts, for Troeltsch was quite capable of writing a single sentence with two hundred words in it. Miss Wyon has added cross-headings to the sections of these two volumes, and these cross-headings diminish the difficulty of reading this fine book. No doubt history is a science, for has not Bury so declared it? Yet those who read the inaugural lecture of this Cambridge Professor will do well to remember that few men took more thought over the arrangement of his matter than he. We certainly cannot utter a similar declaration of these immensely learned labours of Troeltsch. Take an instance. He writes a chapter on Protestantism which runs to 360 pages, and then there are no less than 170 pages of notes appended to it. Nothing can be more formless. Yet when a master of thought like Troeltsch pours forth the results of his investigations into the history of the past, perhaps we do best to receive his great gift with thankfulness, forgetting the form it takes.

There have been histories of thought and there have been histories of action, yet we know no book that so successfully welds thought and action so closely together as this. We read Harnack's *History of Dogma*, and, great as it undoubtedly is, we have often failed to observe the connection between the thinker and the age he is supposed to influence, and indeed we sometimes wondered if he ever did influence his age. In reading Troeltsch there can be no doubt of the connection between the thinker, the thought, and the age, and the environment that shaped the thinker and his thought. This of itself is an outstanding achievement, sufficient to justify not one but repeated perusals of this massive work. Added to this, we cannot possibly overlook the circumstance that Troeltsch is a man with piercing insight, and this insight reveals itself in flashes of illumination that more than repay the trouble in reading his pages, either in his own complex German or even in the clear English of his translator.

Troeltsch begins with the foundation of the Christian Church, and he continues his labour of love till he comes to the eighteenth century. Surely few have ever conceived a more gigantic task or brought it to a more successful conclusion. Inevitably we all seek to observe the milieu out of which early Christianity took its rise, and numberless historians have spent themselves on this piece of work. Troeltsch sets to work, and in his own fashion he conducts his investigation, and in conducting it comes to his own characteristic outlook, and that is the serious part taken by the towns in the rise of the early Church. It is not too much to say that he looks upon the early Church as

essentially a town religion, and he develops his point of view with an amazing wealth of knowledge. It is, of course, possible to disagree with him, but you do so at your own peril, for he supports his views not only with a mass of learning, but also with a depth of insight that is impressive to the last degree. At the same time we noted the omission of many English books that would have seriously aided him in his task. For instance, we saw not a single reference to Dill, Bury, or Ramsay. Now this does not arise from his ignorance of English, for he was deeply versed in our literature. Not only was he versed in our literature, but he was also versed in our pamphlets, especially of the seventeenth century. We all have the defects of our qualities, and even Ernst Troeltsch has his defects.

The survey of mediæval Catholicism is notable, and in it the author lays considerable and deserved stress on the great place occupied by St. Thomas Aquinas. We know nothing better in the whole range of the literature of Thomism than this able and many-sided appreciation. As St. Thomas Aquinas was perhaps the greatest philosophic mind between Aristotle and Descartes, he is amply entitled to all the attention bestowed upon him. He formally re-introduces Aristotle's *Politics* to the attention of men. The outcome of this introduction was a serious change in the conception of the State-Church. Up to this time the institutions of society are regarded as conventional, not natural. These institutions have been devised to correct the vices of human nature since the Fall. The Angelic Doctor taught men the Greek view that the State was much more than a mere institution devised to correct the dire results of the transgression of Adam: it is a vital necessity for all who wish to realize a real and full human life. Here is a point of view that makes its special appeal to Troeltsch, and he has a notable appreciation of all that Thomism meant to the Middle Ages. It is possible—this doubt occurs to us more than once—that the author attributes more to the mind of St. Thomas Aquinas than that great thinker ever held, and we wonder what he would have said of some of the consequences attributed to him in these pages. Yet, after all, is this fair criticism? For if there is more in the *Summa* than he ever perceives, does not this argue the true genius of the writer? Does it not also argue the true genius of the expounder of his system? We withdraw our criticism, convinced that Troeltsch is quite justified in seeing much more in the *Summa* than even its author saw. There is another matter, and here, we must own, we are not satisfied. St. Thomas Aquinas never felt happy if he did not have a definite answer to every question that the brain of man can suggest, for if he did not possess such an answer,

obviously there was a flaw in his system. Accordingly, he sets out—he *must* set out—a complete system. In so setting out his system he denies the very existence of progress, and this point seems to have escaped even the subtle mind of Troeltsch. In fact, there are some matters in these two volumes, and indeed in his other writings, that take us rather aback. It is quite clear that Troeltsch notes the crying need for a history of the idea of equality, which first makes its appearance shortly about the time of Cicero. It is also quite clear that Troeltsch notes the crying need for a history of the law of nature—a book that young Savigny may give us—yet he nowhere notes the outstanding need of a survey of the growth of the idea of progress such as Bury has given us. No doubt Bury's book appeared after 1911 when Troeltsch wrote these two volumes, yet it is singular that he does not seem to take into account that the thought of the Angelic Doctor stood opposed to progress, for did it not contemplate a complete system of knowledge? Did it not refuse to contemplate any additions to that system except those that its creator was prepared to allow?

Practically the whole of the second volume is devoted to the Reformation, and all that the Reformation meant to the Churches. The Roman Church now disappears from these pages, and it is not too much to say that with Anglicanism the author has no more than a bowing acquaintance. Curiously enough, he seems as intimate with the sects of the seventeenth century as M. Halévy is with those of the nineteenth. It is not a little remarkable that both these writers see in these sects the means by which our people learnt the long lesson of self-government. Now we are by no means convinced of the truth of this proposition, and here are our reasons. The local government of our country is highly developed in the sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries before the sects began to count for much in the life of the land. Indeed it is not too much to say that the Stuarts and the Bourbons entertained precisely the same ideas of governing their respective countries. They both employed special courts, they both employed special forms of law, known today in France as the *droit administratif*, and they both employed a bureaucracy. The more we ponder the early history of the Stuarts and the early history of the Bourbons, the more we are convinced of the fundamental likeness of the methods pursued by both dynasties. Why were the Bourbons successful and the Stuarts unsuccessful? There are, of course, many factors, but among the main ones is that the French authorities smashed local government, and the English authorities completely failed in this task. Now the population of England in the days of James I. was about six

millions, chiefly living in the country. In the parish the ruler was the squire, the vicar, the two churchwardens, and in this homely school our ancestors learnt not a little of the art of local government before which the Stuarts ultimately fell.

If Troeltsch is naturally weak on considerations of the inner life of our country, he is naturally strong on similar considerations of his own country. He examines Lutheranism and Calvinism with the keenest insight, and his remarkable appreciation of the latter reflects the highest credit on his acumen. One of the many astonishing matters in the world of thought is to observe the different routes by which men travel to the same conclusion. To Machiavelli the State is a purely human institution, whereas to Luther it is a divine institution. Differing fundamentally in their main idea, it is difficult to detect any agreement between them, yet agreement there is. At bottom the grave matter is that the outcome of the labours of both was the supremacy of the Sovereign. Machiavelli never dreams of resorting to Holy Writ or the Fathers for proof of his conceptions, and Luther constantly resorts to both sources. The methods and the illustrations of the two differ by worlds, and the singular result is the unanimity with which they exalt the State. They essayed the same task, each in accord with his own genius.

The fates of theories are strange, and if the father of one of them could see the developments of some of his own children he would stand aghast. There is a statement of the theory of the Social Pact in the *De Regimine Principum* of St. Thomas Aquinas. To him, as to Hooker in his *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, it furnishes a cogent argument on behalf of absolute monarchy. To Locke it affords a convincing statement on the right of the individual to set a limit to the power of the State. To Rousseau it yields a clear account in favour of an extreme form of democracy. These doctrines are divergent, and yet there is nothing in this whole book more impressive than the exhibition of similar divergencies of thought.

Fine as is the appreciation of Luther, that of Calvin is even finer. No doubt the Reformation restored to the heart that freedom which had long been denied to it, and, with the logical precision and severity of his race, Calvin furthered that freedom. For the Reformation was primarily a revival of religion, a renewal of man's unending yearning for communion with God. Nothing is more outstanding in the analysis of Calvin's thought than the subtle manner in which Troeltsch links together the individualism and the corporateness in the *Institutes*. In order to secure the right of the affirmation of individuality the old doctrinal system had to be swept away and a new one built

on its ruins—the new spirit had to express itself in new forms. The materials for the structure were no longer the Bible and tradition, but the Bible alone, and Troeltsch discloses the outcome of this new attitude. The architecture of the building, however, depended on the character of the builders. And so we have Luther with his curious mixture of reliance on the letter of what pleased him and daring criticism of what did not; the English reformers with that remarkable combination of new and old partly determined by their political circumstances; and Calvin with the pitiless logic so characteristic of the French temper, so unassailable in his conclusions when his premises are granted. Are not all these matters to be found in the pages of this great thinker, whom we could wish had been an equally great writer?

We lay down our pen, and we go back to the summer of 1911, and we think of the many times we have taken down these two volumes, and the many more times we shall now take them down in their English dress. As we meditate on the last twenty years, we recognize that we owe a debt to Troeltsch we shall never be able to repay, and if this debt is sometimes by disagreement as well as by agreement, Troeltsch would be the last man to quarrel with us.

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

NOTICES

ON PRAYER: SPIRITUAL INSTRUCTIONS ON THE VARIOUS STATES OF PRAYER ACCORDING TO THE DOCTRINE OF BOSSUET, BISHOP OF MEAUX. By J. P. de Caussade, S.J., translated by Algar Thorold. With an Introduction by Dom John Chapman, Abbot of Downside, and a Preface by the late Father Ludovic de Besse, O.S.F.C. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. 6s.

De Caussade is known by his *Abandonment to Divine Providence*, a work put together after his death from his letters. The present treatise is the only work he published, and that anonymously, during his lifetime. During the eighteenth century all prayer that was not of the most formal kind was suspected of Quietism, so De Caussade sheltered himself behind Bossuet, the champion of orthodoxy, and reproduced the valuable material to be found in the *Instruction sur les divers états d'oraison*, but which was swamped in controversy and erudition. The aim of this digest is to instruct and reassure souls drawn to the Prayer of Quiet, but afraid of Quietism. It is in two parts, the first theoretical, the second practical. The second part has been occasionally reprinted. This is the first English edition of both parts, and a French one, edited by M. Bremond, has also just appeared. To the historically-minded student of Mystical Theology this is valuable, but the mere seeker for help and instruction will find the first

part dull, too much concerned with a long-forgotten controversy. But the second part is admirable, and cannot but be precious to diffident souls and those who have the care of them. Unfortunately it has no literary pretensions and is written in the form of dialogues, full of repetitions and redundancies. The translation is good, but one could wish that it might be reproduced for ordinary use in a rewritten form. There is a valuable introduction by the Abbot of Downside.

V. I. RUFFER.

THE SYMPHONY OF LIFE. By Charles E. Scott-Moncrieff. Basil Blackwell. 1s.

The *Testament of Beauty* has proved that the philosophic poem can win a hearing even in an age of lyrics. Here in Canon Scott-Moncrieff's *Symphony of Life* is a Christian philosophy beautifully expressed. The Prologue ascribes it to a Peakland parson, saving his soul by music amid the mundane surroundings of a village. Life to him is "the eternal symphony of Love Divine" after service has adequately said her say; its temporal expression is marred in the World-Soul, heard imperfectly by man, and only completely expressed when

"the human chord
Throbbing for ever in the Eternal Life,
Came down to earth, and found His instrument,
A human form, complete as none had been
In rhythmic cadence to express the notes,
The human notes within the Life Divine."

We may thank the writer for a noble poem, simply expressed in Wordsworthian blank verse, dashed here and there with a Browning touch; he has evidently enjoyed giving in this poetical form the answer of a lifetime's experience and reverent thought to the question "What is Life?" The joy of the poet is a thing to be shared.

W. J. FERRAR.

STUDIEN ZUR VORMOSAISCHEN GOTTESVORSTELLUNG. By I. Rabin. M. and H. Marcus. Breslau. M. 4.

Dr. Rabin is a learned Jew, who has mastered the relevant literature concerning Genesis and Hebrew origins, so far as German works are concerned. He claims that a scholar who is of the faith studied, and knows it as a living tradition, is in a stronger position than an outsider. His thesis is that polytheism can never become monotheism, as the prevailing theory holds; that the faith of Abraham and Moses was monotheism, and can only have originated through revelation. One would like this to be proved true, but probably the evidence for an originally pure stream of monotheism, which persisted through Hebrew history, will always be insufficient to convince doubters. "Originated through revelation" is itself an ambiguous phrase. In Dr. Rabin's mind an evolutionary view of revelation is excluded, and with all his learning he is essentially at the fundamentalist stage of theological thinking, in spite of his critical equipment.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

A NEWMAN SYNTHESIS. Arranged by Erick Przywara, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

Theological books of the last century are, for the most part, a drug in the market, as any second-hand bookseller's catalogue shows. Possibly the Anglo-Catholic Centenary in 1933 may revive an interest in the books of the leaders and followers of that Revival; at present, with one exception, they seem in no great demand. The one exception is John Henry Newman; in him and in his writings public interest is both wide and strong. Partly this may be due to the beauty of his English, certainly it is due, also, to the depth and sincerity of his thought. And when Newman writes of the most sacred things of all, of God and His work in the soul, the depth of his thought is not less remarkable than its perfect clearness.

Years ago Mr. W. S. Lilly edited a book of selections from Newman's writings, but a far more systematic book is here. Fr. Przywara originally printed, in German, in six volumes an account of Newman's thought about the spiritual life, practically a *Summa*. Beginning with fallen man's approach to Christianity, going to his conviction of Christ as his Saviour, it concluded with redeemed man's path in Christianity. That great work, by the omission of the "arguments" displaying its scheme, has been here compressed into one volume of convenient size and shape, and is, as the Publisher's Note says, "all Newman."

It is a masterly study of very great value. It is singularly free from controversial matter, and the compiler has not gone out of his way to include famous passages exhibiting Newman's eloquence. Some of the most famous, the poignant apostrophe in the Parting of Friends, the tremendous description of the mental sufferings of the Lord in His Passion, the terrible picture of Demos at the Judgment, to name no others, are not here. In the book is a study not of Newman's eloquence, but of his deepest thought about life lived for God, with God, and in God. The passages are chosen from the whole range of Newman's works, a good many from his Anglican sermons. Thus the learned Jesuit compiler has not flinched from including matter written or preached when Newman was, from the strictly Roman point of view, an unconfirmed layman and a schismatic. One omission should be remedied: in the List of Abbreviations to Works Quoted there is no mention of Mr. Wilfrid Ward's *Life of the Cardinal*. Yet there are quotations from it as "Ward" on p. 119 and elsewhere. The book is a fine and valuable bit of work; it exhibits clearly, simply, and systematically the hold of a great mind upon the things of God.

S. L. OLLARD.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. (Clarendon Bible.) By F. D. V. Narborough. Clarendon Press. 4s. 6d.

This is perhaps the best of a good series. The Hebrews is so difficult that a good scholar can still introduce substantial improvements in the rendering and exegesis. This Canon Narborough has done; not only so, but he knows what to omit, so that nearly everything necessary is said in short compass. His own theory of the destination and purpose of the Epistle is attractive. The destination is perhaps the province of Asia. In any case, the recipients are in a similar state of mind to the Colossians, influenced by a Judaising Gnosticism. This is especially helpful in explain-

ing the references to angels, and is compatible with a date either before or after 70. A.D.

One or two details may be noted. "Saying in David" (iv. 7) means "saying in the psalms"; cf. Rom. xi. 2 "in Elijah" (R.V. marg.). The precise shade of meaning is, therefore, not, as Canon Narborough puts it, "in David's day", or "in David [God] . . . opened up a new period of probation." In vi. 10 the writer, we are told, "doubtless borrowed the phrase 'ministered unto the saints' from St Paul." But why should it not have been part of the general Christian vocabulary, inherited by the writer and St Paul alike? In ix. 23 that the heavenly realities needed cleansing is called an "extraordinary statement." But the background of angelic cult to which Canon Narborough points suggests that the thought of imperfection in the heavenlies is not out of place. Col. i. 20 expressly speaks of Christ reconciling "things in the heavens." The pictures are decorative rather than illustrative, but none the worse for that—Hebrews does not require pictorial illustrations. But a picture of the headdress of a Sumerian prince, labelled "the magnificent civilization of Ur," was probably included by the publisher's art editor as a last resort.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NOVIUS ORGANUM. By James Clark McKerrow, M.B. Longmans, Green, and Co. 9s.

This volume consists of a collection of papers written at different times between the years 1925 and 1930. Consequently, there is a somewhat irritating amount of repetition in the book, which, instead of moving steadily towards a goal, meanders (obscurely at times) around a single theme. This can be stated quite simply: it is that the universe must be understood as a combination of Accident and Habit, both Necessity and Purpose being eliminated. "In the beginning was the Accident" (we are told) and the Accident became Habit. This simple philosophy explains everything, including (as the author generously admits) the explanation itself.

Such a theory savours too much of the process of sawing off the branch upon which one is sitting. It seems to provide no *ποῦ στῶ*. Behaviourism as psychological method is justifiable, and, indeed, an inevitable part of that method, but when it decks itself in the plumes of metaphysics, it becomes ridiculous. Mr. McKerrow informs us that we must not look for any absolute values. "The good and the beautiful are what we like, and the true what we believe." Perhaps so; but certainly this is not what we *mean* when we employ these terms.

In the last chapter of the book we are surprised to find springing up from this unpromising soil a defence of Theism. The author tells us that in a previous book he had supported a naturalistic hypothesis. He now abandons this. "There is nothing natural . . . but the whole of nature is supernatural. What science cannot explain is supernatural, and science in these days does not profess to explain one single thing." This looks like pantheism, but, we are informed, there is "a difference." For, according to Mr. McKerrow, Nature is a fiction of the imagination, but God is Fact. As for Jesus Christ, "It would be nothing to us if the second Adam were proved to be as mythical as we suppose the first to be."

L. DEWAR.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE CELTIC CHURCH IN IRELAND. By W. S. Kerr, B.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This is a very scholarly presentation of the case for independence of any subjection to the Apostolic See on the part of the Celtic Church of Ireland until well after the Norman conquest. Different readers will judge differently of the degree of success which the author has attained in his attempt to prove this complete independence of Rome. He has, of course, no difficulty whatever in demonstrating the absurdity of the anachronism which would read the atmosphere of the Vatican decrees and of later Papal pronouncements into the world of the dark and earlier Middle Ages. On the other hand, in the case of St. Patrick at least many authorities would question whether the nascent Irish Church was so completely independent of Roman influence and direction as Archdeacon Kerr would have us think.

The story told of the conflicts of this period is far from edifying either on the one side or on the other. To a modern reader the points at issue—namely, the correct date for Easter and the shape of the monastic tonsure—seem trivial in the extreme. They remind us of very similar disagreements in other parts of the Church, such as the ostensible reasons for the great quarrel of East and West—but here no question of even the importance of the *Filioque* was raised—or of the schism of the “Old Believers” in Russia. No doubt in all these cases such matters were symbols of deep racial and cultural antagonisms with which the several contending parties had not enough of the spirit of Christ’s religion successfully to deal.

So far as the general reader is concerned the book before us would have gained much in usefulness by the provision of an introductory chapter, giving shortly an account of the political and ecclesiastical background of the period, and by the addition of a table of dates. To those who come to it, however, with some idea of the general scene, it is a highly interesting and at the same time provocative piece of work.

W. R. V. BRADE.

BUTLER’S LIVES OF THE SAINTS. Edited by H. Thurston, S.J. Vol. III. March. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

SAINTS AND HEROES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. C. P. S. Clarke. Mowbrays. 6s.

The month of March gives the editor of Butler particularly good opportunities for proving that hagiography need not be uninteresting. There are several names of major importance—Benedict, Thomas Aquinas, Gregory, Cyril, Frances of Rome, Chad, Cuthbert—and each account deals admirably with facts and characteristics, neither too briefly nor with too much detail. Nor are the minor saints less interesting, and many a dead name comes to life. Both the various countries and the centuries are fairly equally represented in March. It is especially interesting to find accounts of several later saints whose lives can generally only be found in lengthy biographies or in foreign languages, such as St. Colette, Catherine of Bologna, Clement Mary Hofbauer, Catherine of Sweden, Nicholas v. Flüe, John of Parma. For those who want more scholarly evidence the authorities are in each case given in footnotes.

Saints and Heroes of the Christian Church deals with forty-six of the

least known saints of various countries before the fifteenth century. It is written for "the needs of the general public, and more especially that large class, whether clergy, parents, or professional teachers, whose duty it is to instruct the young of all ages—for when it comes to a story we are nearly all young." And there is a peculiar charm and interest in these stories. They are simply but vividly told, and much admirable use is made of the actual words of the old narratives. Without being in any way childish, many of the stories manage to convey the enchanted atmosphere of the tales read to us by the nursery fireside, and there is a strange beauty in the telling of, for instance, Brendan's glamorous voyage and Odoric's experiences in Cathay. No one can maintain after such reading that the devil has the best tales. May the promise of another volume, dealing with the saints of later centuries, soon be fulfilled.

V. I. RUFFER.

DIE BEIDEN MAKKABÄERBÜCHER. By H. Bévenot. Bonn. P. Hanstein. M. 9.60.

The First Book of Maccabees is one of the grandest war-stories in the world, relating as it does the winning of independence by a little community centred round a temple, or rather by a small group of resolute men within the community who knew what they wanted and were ready to be tortured rather than be turned from their purpose. The persecution by Antiochus was justifiable from his standpoint. The Seleucid Empire was the last bulwark against Rome, but to have any chance of standing it had to be welded into a cultural unit. The bulk of the Jews were ready to accept Hellenization, which but for the fanaticism of a country family at Modin would have been successfully accomplished. But fortune favoured the Maccabees. They stood to the Seleucid army as the Boer farmers in 1899-1902 stood to the forces of the British Empire. In their mountains they were most elusive. Antiochus was surrounded by enemies and, to complete the parallel, we may suppose that France and Germany had attacked England in 1900. Peace would have been concluded on terms very favourable to the Boer Republics. The human factor, however, decided the struggle. Who could stand against men endued with the spirit revealed by that ghastly story in 2 Maccabees? A wounded Jew, pierced with wounds, ran through the crowd at Jerusalem and climbed a high rock. Then he pulled out his bowels through his gaping wounds and shook them at the crowd with both hands—and died. The Second Book of Maccabees is the first *Acta Martyrum*. It stands alone in early Jewish literature in that it assumes a belief in prayers for the dead and the intercession of departed saints.

We have no modern full-length Commentary on Maccabees in English and so Dom Bévenot's big book is to be welcomed. It contains a great deal of research and independent judgment, especially on textual questions, and is clearly indispensable.

His position as regards Inspiration shows the crippling effect of the Biblical Commission upon Catholic scholarship. The lost Hebrew of 1 Maccabees, he declares, was inspired and free from error in theological statement and historical data. The present text has only the authority of the LXX elsewhere. Jason of Cyrene, who wrote the original of 2 Maccabees, was not inspired. But the epitomator not only copied without error but was inspired to select only what was true. The straits

in which a good scholar finds himself, when tied down to this position, are pitiful. In 2 Macc. v. 1-4 we read that armies appeared in the sky for forty days and fought one another. Dom Bévenot cannot call this a legend, and does not seem to understand Jewish symbolism; he suggests meteorological phenomena as an explanation, since even he cannot interpret the story as literal fact. In 1 Macc. viii. 15 the inaccurate account of the Roman Senate is palliated by the statement in v. 1 that Judas only "heard" it. But the number 320 instead of 300 is excused in some measure by mentioning that at a later date the Senate was increased to 600 by including the *equites*. As if the absence of a *Statesman's Year Book* in those days with its inevitable results in loss of strict accuracy had any bearing on the problem of Inspiration!

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

INDEX OF VOLUME XXIII

JULY—DECEMBER, 1931

	PAGE
Anglican's Obligations, The	22
Anglo-Russian Student Conference	90
Anglo-Scandinavian Conference	160
ARMYTAGE, D.	310
ARNOLD, J. H.	34
Attitude of World to Church	209
BALMFORTH, H.	242
BRIBITZ, J. H.	276
BEZZANT, J. S.	278
Books Noticed:	
Ægidii Romani Theoremata. By E. Hocedez	116
An Anglican Use. By H. Spence	115
An Island Bishop. By E. C. Wilson	233
Art of Mental Prayer, The. By Bede Frost	47
Beginnings of Christian Theology. By J. K. Mozley	287
Behaviourism. Edited by W. P. King	284
Berengar and Sacramental Doctrine. By A. J. Macdonald	44
Butler's Lives of the Saints	356
Cambridge Platonists, The. By G. P. K. Pawson	286
Catholic Students' "Aids." By H. Pope	60
Chalcedon. By J. S. MacArthur	177
Child Life and Religion. By I. Forest	292
Christ our Brother. By K. Adam	297
Christian Ethics. By W. R. Inge	181
Christian Socialist Movement, The. By G. C. Binyon	112
Christianity and the New Age. By C. Dawson	227
Christians in China. By A. C. Moule	101
Christina Rossetti. By F. Shore	117
Coles, V. S. S. Edited by J. F. Briscoe	285
Colossians and Philemon. By L. B. Radford	114
Creative Worship. By H. H. Brinton	119
Credo Ecclesiam. Edited by H. Ehrenberg	231
Crisis in the West. By P. Wust	227
Elements of Epistemology. By J. T. Barron	297
Enlightenment and Salvation. By R. M. Shaw	59
Ethiopic Text of Ecclesiasticus. By S. A. B. Mercer	295
Ezekiel, The Book of. By J. Smith	233
Fall of Christianity, The. By G. J. Heering	51
God without Thunder. By J. C. Ransom	294
Gottesreich. By K. Fröhlich	178
Greek Church History. By C. Callinicos	300
Harrowing of Hell, The. By J. A. MacCulloch	53
Head of the Corner, The. By L. M. Sweet	288
I am of Apollos. By A. J. Walker	234
Im Ringen um die Kirche. By F. Heiler	98
In Defence of Purity. By D. v. Hildebrand	295
Independence of Celtic Church, The. By W. S. Kerr	355
India's Religion. By R. Otto	59
Innocent I. By L. Elliott Binns	110
Jesus Christ. By L. de Grandmaison	55
Joachim of Flora. By H. Bett	296
John W. Hoyland. By H. G. Wood	174
Layfolk's History of the Liturgy. By E. C. Thomas	286
L'Enfance Spirituelle. By F. D. Joret	296
Luther and the Reformation. By H. Boehmer	54
Man and the Image of God. By H. M. Foston	176
Martyrdom of Tallacht. By R. I. Best and H. J. Lawlor	292
Meeting of the Roads, The. By R. O. P. Taylor	296
Mind of Christ in Paul, The. By F. C. Porter	110
Mystic Will, The. By H. Brinton	113
New Commandment, The. By C. S. Phillips	58
New Divine Order, The. By K. Heim	284
Office Psalms from Rolle's Psalter. By G. Hodgson	176
Orthodox Church, The. By M. Constantinides	370
Pathways to Certainty. By W. A. Brown	100

	PAGE
Philosophy and the Cross. By O. C. Quick	115
Philosophy of the Good Life, The. By Bishop Gore	169
Prayer and its Psychology. By A. Hodge	106
Prayers from Eastern Liturgies. By D. Attwater	53
Problem of Right Conduct, The. By Peter Green	108
Psychology of Character, The. By R. Allers	291
Psychology of Worship. By P. Moore-Browne	119
Reality of God, The. By Baron v. Hügel	276
Record of the Loved Disciple, The. By E. S. Hoernle	234
Reformation, Catholicism and Freedom. By J. W. Poynter	117
Religion and Culture. By J. Maritain	227
Religion of Man, The. By R. Tagore	287
Reservation and Catholicity	293
Revelation, Meaning of the. By P. Carrington	344
Revelation of Deity, The. By J. E. Turner	235
Riddle of the New Testament. By E. Hoskyns	229
Russian Church, The. By N. Brian-Chaninov	52
Saints and Heroes of the Christian Church. By C. P. S. Clarke	356
St. Theresa in her Writings. By R. Hoornaert	175
St. Thomas Aquinas. By J. F. Scanlan	174
Secret Way of Enclosed Garden. By F. Pilet	286
Secular Priesthood, The. By E. J. Mahoney	289
Short Notes	179, 236
Simon the Zealot. By L. S. Hoyland	111
Sin and the New Psychology. By C. E. Barbour	116
Sitting for the Psalms. By C. F. Rogers	119
Spiritual Pilgrimage, A.	289
Structure of 1928 Liturgy. By H. T. Knight	117
Structure of Thought, The. By L. Fischer	52
Studies of Spanish Mystics. By E. A. Peers	104
Sufferings of Christ, The. By M. B. De Salo	118
Social Teaching of Christian Churches, The. By E. Troeltsch	346
This Church and Realm. By R. H. Malden	290
Thoughts on Problems. By Archbishop Temple	118
Two Kingdoms, The	57
Vision of God, The. By K. E. Kirk	278
Well-Springs, The. By A. Gratry	236
William Blake, Minor Prophecies of. By E. S. Hamblen	283
BULGARKOFF, Professor	9, 63
BURKITT, Professor	101
Can Suicide be Justified?	83
CECIL, Lord H.	303
Christ and Unclean Spirits	87
Christian Idea of Liberty, The	186
Christ's Presence in the Eucharist	303
Church in Russian Theology, The	9
CLARKE, W. K. L.	41, 98, 341
Coptic Baptism, A	220
DAVEY, N.	344
DEWAR, L.	227
Document: Eucharistic Belief	340
DONOVAN, M.	22, 88
DUNPHY, W. H.	330
Editorial	1, 61, 121, 181, 241
Eternal Punishment	272
Ethical Significance of Worship, The	242
Following of the Way, The	79
GEORGE, R. E. G.	149
HARTON, F. P.	47, 131
HEBERT, A. G.	70, 160
HITCHCOCK, F. R. Montgomery	262
HODGSON, L.	169, 186
HOPKINSON, P.	79
Idea of Oblation, The	70
Latin Hymns of Middle Ages	26
LILLEY, Canon	44, 166
Liturgica	39, 88
MACKENZIE, K. D.	39
MASCALL, E. L.	90

	PAGE
Ministerial Training	310
Miscellaneous	39, 87, 159, 220, 272, 340
Modes of Episcopal Election	262
Mortification	131
MURRAY, R. H.	346
Notes and Comments	39, 87, 159, 220, 272
PADWICK, Miss C.	220
Periodicals, Notes on	91, 342
PITTINGER, W. N.	324
POPE, R. M.	26
Religion of the Incarnation, The	324
ROBERTS, Mrs. E.	209
Sacraments of the Church, The	123
Second Coming of Our Lord, The	330
SELWYN, Dean	1, 61, 121, 181, 229, 241, 301
Son of Man Coming in Clouds, The	14
SPENS, W.	123
Studies in Texts	42
TILLYARD, A.	104
Transformation of Mediævalism, The	149
VALENTINE, C. H.	14
Village Eucharist, The	34
Vox Sponsæ	223
Weak Things of the World, The	335
WELLINGTON, H. M.	223
WILLINK, M. D. R.	335
WILSON, H. R.	83
WYATT, E. G. P.	272

